Lay us 1
001
.E17
v.3

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

(MONTHLY)

VOL. III.] EDITED BY REV. H. J. HEUSER. [NO. 2.

Professor of Exegesis and Introd. to S. Script., Theol. Seminary, Overbrook, Pa.

"*Ut Ecclesia ædificationem accipiat.*"
I. Cor. xiv. 5.

AUGUST.

1890.

FR. PUSTET & CO.,

NEW YORK AND CINCINNATI.

SUBSCRIPTION, FOR THE UNITED STATES and CANADA, $3.50 per annum.
EUROPEAN COUNTRIES, $4.00. AUSTRALIA, $4.50

Literary Communications and Books for Review to be addressed to the Editor;
Business matters and Subscriptions, to the Publishers.

Entered at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., for transmission through the mails at Second-Class Rates

Adprobatio.

Ephemerides Catholicas studio theologicarum disciplinarum promovendo, rebusque ecclesiasticis explicandis atque tuendis addictas, quæque hunc titulum præseferunt, AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, vehementer probamus cleroque commendamus.

J. CARD. GIBBONS,
Arch. Balt.

BALTIMORÆ,
die 22 *Junii*, 1889.

Imprimatur.
MICHAEL A. CORRIGAN,
Arch. Neo-Ebor.

Imprimatur.
PATRITIVS JOANNES RYAN,
Archiep. Philadelph.

NEO-EBORACI, *die m. Jul.* 25, 1890.

PHILADELPHIÆ, *die m. Jan.* 1, 1890.

H. GABRIELS, S. T. D.,
Censor Deputatus.

RECOMMENDATION.

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA.
Washington, D. C., Nov. 2, 1889.

Messrs. FR. PUSTET & Co.

Gentlemen: By all means enroll me as subscriber to the REVIEW from its first number. So excellent a periodical deserves the hearty encouragement of all ecclesiastics.

Yours in Christ, JOHN J. KEANE

AMERICAN

ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

VOL. III.—AUGUST, 1890.—NO. 2.

VARIATIONS IN THE RITES OF THE CHURCH.

UNITY is one of the distinguishing notes of the true Church. Dispersed throughout the world, her members everywhere profess but one Lord, one faith, one baptism.[1] Although many members yet one body,[2] by the same faith they are all inflamed with the same charity, and their hopes and aspirations are directed to the same end. From her foundation her faith has remained unaltered in substance. That variations in her rites and ceremonies, the outward expression of her belief, should exist without detriment to her unity is itself a mark of her divine origin. For, as she was instituted by her Divine Founder for all tribes and nations, so, to gain all to Christ, she conforms herself to their various customs and habits. Her different rites are the "golden borders" with which the Psalmist foretold the Spouse of Christ would be clothed.[3]

In two former articles on the subject of the Western and Eastern Liturgies[4] we gave an historical outline of these. To make the sketch complete, we shall now draw attention to the principal differences existing between the rites of the East and those of the West.

[1] Ephes. iv. 5. [2] I. Cor. xii. 12.

[3] *In fimbriis aureis, circumamicta varietatibus.*—Ps. xliv. 14.

[4] *Am. Eccles. Review*, June and July, 1890.

I. *Language.*—In the Western Church, Latin is the liturgical language. As to the Oriental Liturgies, we have already enumerated the languages in which they are written. We need here only add that they are not the vernacular that is used in ordinary daily intercourse in those countries, but the pure, classical language, unknown to most of the people and not unfrequently even to the clergy, so that in some places a literal translation of the liturgy in the vernacular is added to the text for the use of the celebrant.

II. *Sacraments.*—In the West, baptism is ordinarily conferred by *ablution;* in the East, by *immersion.* In the Latin Church, the bishop is the ordinary minister of Confirmation, though a priest, by special delegation of the Holy See, may administer this sacrament. In the Oriental Church it is conferred by the priest immediately after baptism. Not only the forehead is anointed, but the eyes, ears, nostrils, mouth, hands, and feet also. Extreme Unction with us is conferred by one priest only, but in the East, though one priest may validly administer this sacrament, ordinarily three and often seven are employed.

We use the *indicative* form in administering the sacraments, they the *deprecative* form.

III. *Liturgical Books.*—In the Western Church five different books are in use: the *Missal, Breviary, Ritual, Pontifical,* and *Ceremonial.* Down to the ninth century four distinct books were employed in the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice:—The *Antiphonary,* which is attributed to St. Gregory the Great, contained the Introit, Gradual, Tract, Offertory, and Versicles of the Communion, or in general the parts to be sung by the choir. The *Lectionary,* in which the Lessons taken from the Old and New Testaments were to be found, was compiled for the subdeacons and lower attendants. The *Evangelistary,* which contained portions of the Gospels to be sung by the deacon. These are attributed to St. Jerome, who arranged them by order of Pope Damasus.[1] The

[1] The Lectionary and Evangelistary were commonly bound in one volume.

Sacramentary, which comprised the Collects, Secrets, Prefaces, and Canon, or in general the prayers to be recited by the celebrant. These were collected in one volume, which was called the *Missale Plenarium*,—the *Roman Missal* at the present day. The *Breviary* contains the daily Office, which is recited by those in sacred orders. The *Ritual* is used in the administration of the sacraments. The *Pontifical* comprises all the prayers of the services at which bishops preside. The *Ceremonial* is a complex of all the ceremonies used in the various services of the Church. The three last were formerly added to the Sacramentary, of which SS. Gregory the Great and Gelasius are the authors.

If we say that the ecclesiastical books of the Greek Church are almost innumerable, we are only repeating the words of Leo Allatius, a person well versed in the Liturgy of his own Church.[1] We shall notice only the principal books used at the Holy Sacrifice and in the recitation of the Office. Of those used at the altar we may mention 1. The *Anagnosis*, which corresponds to the Latin Lectionary. It contains Lessons taken from the Old and New Testaments. 2. Similar to this is the *Apostolos*, containing portions of the canonical Epistles. 3. The *Praxapostolos*, comprising excerpts from the Acts of the Apostles. In the Latin Church the subdeacon and lower attendants read the Lessons; in the Greek Church they are recited by the deacon. 4. The *Evangelion*, which contains parts of the four Gospels, systematically arranged for the Feasts and Sundays of the year. These are read by a priest. 5. The *Diptychs*, tablets on one of which are inscribed the names of the patriarchs and bishops who govern the various Churches, and on the other the names of those who died in communion with the Church. 6. The *Diaconicon*, containing the various duties of the deacon in all the

[1] Græcorum libri ecclesiastici in eam jam excreverunt molem, ut attentius introspicienti haud fieri posse videatur ut per annum, ab homine id studiosius incumbente, nec aliis negotiis implicito recitentur. *Apud Cave, Script. Ecc. Hist. Literar.*, II., Append. Geneva, 1720, p. 179.

services of the Church. 7. The *Liturgicon*, which comprises the Liturgies of St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, and of the Presanctified. And to these may be added, 8., the *Typicon*, which corresponds to our Ordo or Kalendarium, but is more diffuse. It notes in detail what must be recited and sung during Mass, in the Office, and at all the services, gives a list of the fast-days, and describes the manner in which these fasts must be observed.

In the divine Office they use 1. the *Psalterion*, containing the Psalms of David. 2. The *Triodion*, comprising the Offices from Septuagesima to Holy Saturday. 3. The *Pentecostarion*, with the Offices from Easter Sunday to the Octave of Pentecost. 4. The *Hymnologion*, containing hymns with musical notes. 5. The *Menæa*, containg the Offices of the Saints. 6. The *Menologion*, which corresponds to our Martyrology. 7. The *Synaxaria*, which are compendiums of the Triodion, Pentecostarion, and Menæa. The *Octœchus* and *Paracletica*, which are the choral or musical books.

The Greeks are obliged to refer to these different books both during Mass and in their Office. To avoid this inconvenience other books were introduced, which contain in a compendious form the contents of all, and these are called *Anthologion*, which corresponds to our Breviary, and *Horologion*, which takes the place of the *Horæ Diurnæ*. These books are used by the other Oriental Churches, but in a few cases their names have been changed.[1]

The *Euchologion* takes the place of our Ritual. It contains the rites and order of their Liturgy and the ecclesiastical

[1] Their theologians differ in opinion concerning the obligation of reciting the Office, except for bishops and monks, who are obliged to recite it daily. Priests, therefore, whether married or single, apply and make use of the principle *in dubiis libertas*. In general it is left to their individual conscience, but they are supposed to recite as much of the daily office as time or circumstances will allow. They usually recite the Little Hours, which, except on Christmas and the Epiphany and during Holy Week, consist of five psalms each, and are the same throughout the year. We remember to have heard from very good authority, that, were they to perform all the services of the Church, it would take some days from five to seven hours to accomplish the task.

services of the morning and evening, the formulas of the sacraments, benedictions, and blessings. The *Archieraticon* corresponds to our Pontifical. With regard to books of ceremonies the Oriental Churches are very deficient. The only one that has come to our notice is that by George Codinus, entitled, *De Officialibus Palatii Cplitani et de Officiis Magnæ Ecclesiæ.* We may here remark, that the Orientals, except the Maronites and Greek-Melchites, who follow the *Gregorian*, have their peculiar calendars.

IV. *Celibacy.*—Although both Matrimony and Holy Orders bear the sacred seal of their divine institution as sacraments in the Catholic Church, it is plain that the divided affections and absorbing cares of the former must be at times a hindrance to the free exersise of that charity and sacrifice to which the priest is almost constantly called. St. Paul well expresses this in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, where he says: "He that is without a wife, is solicitous for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please God. But he that is with a wife, is solicitous for the things of the world, how he may please his wife: and he is divided."[1] Hence, from the time of the Apostles, who, according to St. Jerome, either were virgins or, if married, observed perpetual continence after their call,[2] the Latin Church exacted from bishops, priests, and deacons the observance of celibacy, or, in case they had previously married, of perpetual continence after receiving sacred orders. The same obligation was imposed upon those who were admitted to the subdiaconate, which since the twelfth century ranked as a sacred or major order.

According to some, the reception of holy orders was considered an impediment to subsequent marriage, which rendered the latter *invalid*, as early as the sixth century.

[1] I. Cor. vii. 32, 33.

[2] Christus virgo, virgo Maria utrique sexui virginitatis dedicavere principia. Apostoli vel virgines, vel post nuptias continentes.—*Ep.* 48, *ad Pammach.* Op. Venet., 1766, I., 233.

It certainly was such from the twelfth century, and previously was regarded as a *prohibiting* impediment in the same sense in which the reception of minor orders at the present day renders marriage *illicit*, although, when contracted, it becomes valid, depriving the cleric at the same time of the faculty of exercising the orders which he has received.

The Council of Trent renewed this obligation of celibacy for clerics in sacred orders: "Si quis dixerit clericos in sacris ordinibus constitutos posse matrimonium contrahere, contractumque validum esse non obstante lege ecclesiastica, anathema sit."[1] The only cases in which the Latin Church allows married men to be advanced to Sacred Orders are: first, si mulier sit adultera; secondly, if the wife consent to her husband's receiving Sacred Orders and herself enters religion, or if, her age warranting her remaining in the world, she makes a vow of perpetual chastity.

In the *Oriental* Church the case is different. Bishops, priests, and deacons are not allowed to marry after ordination. If priests and deacons are married before they are advanced to sacred orders, they are permitted to remain so. In case, however, such persons are selected for the episcopate, they must separate from their wives with the consent of the latter, who are likewise obliged to enter religion, or else make a vow of perpetual continency in the world. As a rule monks, who have made the vow of perpetual chastity, or celibate priests only are promoted to the episcopate. The subdiaconate being enumerated among the minor orders in the Eastern Church, subdeacons are allowed to contract marriage after receiving this order, except among the Greeks in Italy and the adjacent islands, who are under the jurisdiction of bishops of the Latin rite. Benedict XIV, in his Const. *Etsi Pastoralis*, 1742, not only declares marriage among these invalid, but ordains that those who attempt it are to be deposed from their office and separated.[2]

[1] Sess. 24, can 9.

[2] Statim ab ordine erit deponendus, et ab illegitima uxore separandus. *Bull. Ben.* XIV, Romæ, 1746, tom. I., Const. 57, § 7, n. 27.

The question of the validity of matrimony contracted by those in Sacred Orders in the Oriental Church is doubtful. The Council *in Trullo* declares it only illicit.[1] Benedict XIV, however, in his Const. "*Eo quamvis*," 1745, § 38, after referring to the conflicting opinions of theologians on this point, inclines to the opinion, which he says is comformable to the praxis of the Roman Congregations, that it is invalid. This opinion is corroborated by later documents. The Congr. of the Propaganda, in its Instruction to the Archbishop of Fogaras, dated March 24, 1858, by order of Pius IX, declare these marriages invalid.[2] Hence, in point of law and theoretically, it still remains doubtful, but considering the expressed mind of the Holy See, the former opinion cannot any longer be practically sustained. Clerics in holy orders who are married are obliged to observe continence during the time in which they are engaged in the ministry of the Altar.[3]

V. *Fasts.*—In the Latin Church the number of fast-days prescribed in the year amounts to about sixty; the forty-days of Lent, the Ember-days, and the vigils of some solemn feasts. Sunday was never observed as a fast-day. Hence the Sundays during Lent are not enumerated among the forty

[1] Quoniam in Apostolicis, etc., ... decernimus ut deinceps nulli penitus hypodiacono, vel diacono, vel presbytero post sui ordinationem matrimonium contrahere *liceat*."—Can. vi. *Sacr. Conc. Coll.* Labbeus et Cossartius, Florentiæ, 1765. Tom. xi., p. 945.

[2] Quod si aliqui (quod Deus avertat) post sacros, ut præfertur, *matrimonium attentare* præsumpserint, decernit Sanctitas Sua ut ad tramites sacrorum canonum severe puniantur.—Santi, *Prælect. Juris Can.*, Ratisb., 1886, vol. iii., p. 35.

[3] See Benedict XIV, *De Sacrificio Missæ*, lib. III., c. xi., n. 11. Clemens VIII, in Instructione super aliquibus Græcorum ritibus, quæ incipit, "*Presbyteri Græci*," ita ait: *Presbyter Græcus conjugatus ante Sacrum Sacrificium seu Sanctam Missam celebrandam, vel per hebdomadum, vel per triduum abstineat ab uxore* (Opera, Romæ, 1748, tom. ix. p. 226). And Lib. III., c. iii., n. 10, p. 270, he alleges this obligation as a reason why Greek priests do not celebrate daily. "De ecclesiæ Græcæ ritu patet, illum ex eo ortum, quod sacerdotes uxores habeant, a quibus cum multo ante tempore debeant secubare, quam missam celebrent, idcirco non possunt quotidie sacrificare.

days of this season, and if the vigil of any great feast fall on that day it is anticipated on Saturday. The essence of fasting consists in taking one meal only, and in abstaining from flesh meat.[1] Friday and Saturday throughout the year are days of abstinence.[2]

In the East fast-days are more numerous, and the fast is more severe. The Greeks begin their Lent on Monday after Quinquagesima, and since they never fast on Sunday and Saturday except Holy Saturday, it consists of thirty-six days, which number was observed in the Latin Church during the first centuries. Besides this season, they fast on Wednesday and Friday throughout the year, and observe three other seasons of fast. 1. From Monday after Trinity Sunday to the feast of the Apostles SS. Peter and Paul (June 29). The length of this fast depends upon the date of Easter. It may consist of eight days, or even as many as forty-two. 2. From Aug. 1 to the feast of the Assumption of Our Lady (Aug. 15). 3. From Nov. 15 to the Feast of the Nativity of Our Lord. To these must be added the vigils of some of their great patrons. The total number of their fasting-days in the year cannot, therefore, be less than 190, and at times it reaches 230.

The Syrian Jacobites fast three days after Septuagesima Sunday. They call it the fast of the *Ninivites*, because it was introduced at a time when they were visited with a plague, for the cessation of which, after the manner of the Ninivites, they implored God by fasting and prayer. Their great Lent consists of forty-eight days, and their season of fast before the feast of the Apostles begins on Whit-Monday. They fast two weeks before the Assumption of the B. V. and Christmas, besides many vigils of feast-days. The total number of their fasting days is between 190 and 230. The Copts and Ethiopian schismatics follow the Syrian Jacobites in their fasts.

[1] By special dispensation the use of meat is allowed during Lent once a day on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays, except the second and last Saturday.

[2] By special dispensation we are allowed to use meat on Saturdays.

The Syrian Nestorians observe the fasts of the Syrian Jacobites, except that in a few cases the number of days is smaller. But in addition they fast three days after the Epiphany, and observe a season of seven weeks in summer, which they denominate the fast of Elias, so that their fasting days reach in some years the number 265.

The Armenians do not observe the same fasts everywhere. All begin their Lent on Monday after Quinquagesima. In general they fast seven days before the Epiphany and five days after Pentecost and the feast of the Assumption, which they always celebrate on a Sunday, and besides observe many vigils. The number of their fasting-days is small when compared with that of the other Orientals.

Nothing can equal the rigor of the fasts of Lent observed by the Orientals. Meat, fish, cheese, eggs, butter, oil, and milk are strictly forbidden, even on Saturdays and Sundays, though on these days, which are never considered fast-days, they are allowed to take more than one meal.[1] The only food permitted to be eaten with bread is vegetables, honey, and dried fruits. Some take no food before sunset;[2] others take their meal at three o'clock in the afternoon or even at noon. For many centuries wine was forbidden; but it is now permitted, though the Jacobites do not taste it during Holy Week, and on the last three days of this week they abstain from food altogether.[3]

VI. *Altars.*—As there is no religion without a sacrifice, so there is no sacrifice without an altar. Hence in the Church, in which the most acceptable of all sacrifices, the Body and Blood of the Immaculate Lamb, is offered to Almighty God, we find frequent mention made of altars. It is impossible to determine of what material they were constructed in the

[1] By universal custom they use fish on the feast of the Annunciation and Palm Sunday.

[2] The Syrian Jacobites and the schismatical Armenians follow this custom.

[3] Formerly monks and pious Christians partook of no food during Holy Week. See St. Augustine, *Ep.* 86, and St. Gregory Naz. *ad Hellen de Monachis.*

first centuries. Christ celebrated the institution of this sacrifice on an ordinary table, which was probably made of wood. At present an altar of the same material is preserved in the Church of St. Pudentiana at Rome, upon which St. Peter and his successors down to St. Sylvester are said to have offered the Holy Sacrifice. Although we have no documents upon which to base our assertion, yet it is commonly supposed that St. Sylvester ordained that altars should be made of stone. It is certain, however, that long after this pontificate altars of wood were still in use.[1] These altars of stone, naturally large, bulky, and heavy, were stationary and immovable. But as bishops and priests in their peregrinations were often obliged to celebrate in churches and oratories which did not possess consecrated stone altars, they carried with them stone tablets, which were sufficiently large for the chalice and its appurtenances. These were consecrated by the bishop and were called *portable* altars (*altaria portatilia*), to distinguish them from the stone altars, which were called fixed or immovable (*fixa et immobilia*). Of these Hincmar of Rheims makes mention in his *Capitula*.[2] In the East, however, the indiscriminate use of wooden or stone altars was allowed down to the tenth century. After that date, the Sacred Liturgy was forbidden to be celebrated on any other than stone altars. In absence of these altars, the Orientals never use the portable tablets, but in their stead they employ the *Antimension*. This is an oblong piece of silk or linen,[3] which has a purse or bag,

[1] Many altars were made of silver and gold. Sozomenus, *Hist. Eccles.*, Paris, 1686, Lib. IX., c. 1, and Nicephorus, *Hist. Eccles.*, Migne, *Patr. Græc.*, *Paris*, 1865, Lib. XIV., c. 2, narrate, that Pulcheria, daughter of Arcadius, presented an altar of this kind to the basilica in Constantinople.

[2] Quapropter, si necessitas poposcerit, donec ecclesia vel altaria consecrentur, et in capellis etiam, quæ consecrationem non merentur, tabulam quisque presbyter de marmore . . . . confectatam habeat, et nobis ad consecrandum afferat, in qua sacra mysteria agere valeat.—*In cap. anno XII. Episc. superaddita*, § iii., c. 3, Migne, Paris, 1879.

[3] Romanoff, *Rites and Customs of the Græco-Russian Church*, says it is sixteen inches square. See O'Brien, *Hist. of the Mass*, pag. 118.

containing saints' relics, attached to each corner. They are consecrated by the bishop with as much ceremony as our portable altars. Without this *antimension* it is unlawful to celebrate Mass.[1] Rome not only never condemned this custom of the Orientals, but Benedict XIV [2] permitted it to be used by the Greeks and Albanians inhabiting Italy, but forbids it to be employed by the Latins.[3] In a later Constitution,[4] however, he made a special concession for its use to the Latin missionaries celebrating the Holy Sacrifice in the churches of the United Ruthenians of Russia-Poland, in case no portable altars could be had.[5]

Grancolas, Bocquillot, Benedict XIV, and others[6] are of opinion that as in the East so also in the West there was originally only one altar in each church, upon which the Holy Sacrifice was offered only once a day. They base their opinion upon passages of the Fathers and Councils, in which reference is made to a single altar. Bona, Sala, Mabillon, and others hold the contrary opinion.[7] They assert, that these passages may be interpreted as having reference to the principal altar of the Church, at which either the bishop pontificated or Solemn Mass was celebrated, and they produce many testimonies which indicate that many altars existed in one church, and that many Masses were often celebrated on them the same day.

[1] Bona, *Rev. Lit.*, Aug. Taurinorum, 1749, Tom. II., p. 70.

The *Syrian Jacobites* allow their priest to celebrate on a leaf of the Gospel, or even on the deacon's hands, in absence of the antimension. Sumendum est folium ex Evangeliis, et in loco deserto manibus Diaconorum uti potest sacerdos defectu Antimensii. *Abulfaragius in Nomocanone suo.* See Bona, *ibidem.*

[2] *Etsi Pastoralis*, § vi., n. 17. *Bullarium*, Rome, 1746, p. 175.

[3] *Ibidem*, no. 19.

[4] *Impesito Nobis*, 1751, § 1. *Bullarium*, Rome, 1753.

[5] Clement VIII in 1602 permitted United Ruthenian priests to celebrate on the altars and with the chalices and vestments of the churches of the Latin rite, but they were obliged to make use of their own rite, and *vice versa* to the Latin priests. —Zitelli, *Apparatus Juris Eccles.*, Rome, 1886, p. 250.

[6] See Benedict XIV, *De Sacrificio Missæ*, Lovanii, 1762, Pars. I., c. 17, p. 27.

[7] *See* Bona, *Rer. Lit.*, Aug. Taur., Tom. I., Lib. I., c. 14, pp. 286, 287.

If we except the Maronites and a few other individual churches, which follow the Roman custom, the Orientals have preserved their ancient custom of having in their churches only one altar, upon which they celebrated only once a day. Benedict XIV [1] permitted the Greeks and Albanians of Italy to follow this custom in their churches, but at the same time allowed them to erect smaller altars in their churches, upon which many Masses could be celebrated daily by Latin and Greek priests.

The Greek Melchites petitioned the Holy See to be allowed to celebrate more than one Mass on the same altar in their churches on Mt. Libanus, but Benedict XIV [2] declined to grant such permission, but allowed them to erect several altars in their churches, upon which one Mass might be celebrated daily. If, however, the altars were insufficient for the number of priests who desired to celebrate, or for satisfying the pious intentions of the faithful, he permitted the custom of *concelebrating*, or of having several priests unite in offering the same Mass. When they thus celebrate each must wear the sacred vestments, recite all the prayers of the Mass, and pronounce the words of consecration, just as if he were celebrating alone. In this manner they can satisfy the obligation of celebrating for the intention of the person giving a stipend. The only vestige of this Mass in the Latin Church is at the ordination of a priest or the consecration of a bishop. In the former case, the *ordinandus* celebrates with the ordaining bishop from the offertory, but he receives under one kind only; in the latter, the *consecrandus* celebrates with the consecrating bishop from the beginning to the end of Mass, and receives under both species. This custom still obtains in the East, where there is only one church in the city, and was observed for many centuries in the West. Innocent III assures us, that in his

[1] *Etsi Pastoralis*, 1742, § vi., n. 8, 9; *Bull.*, Rome, 1746, Tom. I.
[2] *Demandatum Cœlitus*, 1743, n. 8, 9; *Bullarium*, Tom. I.

day the Cardinals concelebrated with the Roman Pontiff.[1]

To consult the wishes of those who desire to celebrate privately, the Greeks erect small chapels near the principal church. They contain each one altar, upon which one Mass may be celebrated each day. They are called *Parecclesiæ.*

Besides these important differences, many others of less note exist between the Churches of the East and West. We shall not delay in treating them. Our article, however, would be imperfect did we not add a few observations on the obligation imposed upon us of following the rite to which we belong, and make a few remarks on the communication *in divinis* between the Latins and Orientals.

VII. The different rites in the East and West and the various customs of religion which have received the approbation of the Holy See have the force of law. Consequently all the faithful are obliged to observe their peculiar rite, and can be absolved from it by the highest authority in the Church only. They are not at liberty to desert that to which they belong and pass to another without a special permission, nor is any superior allowed to permit his subjects or persuade those over whom he has no jurisdiction to change their rite, unless he has received power for such an action from the Holy See. Benedict XIV, in his Constitution "*Demandatum Nobis*" of 1743, and "*Etsi Pastoralis*" of 1742,[2] treats this obligation of adhering to one's peculiar rite with great minuteness, and shows with what care, diligence, and solicitude the Church has ever guarded and tried to preserve ancient Oriental customs. In the first-mentioned Constitution, in which he treats of the rites and customs of the Greek Melchites, (*a*) he forbids any one, be he even bishop or patriarch, to change any rite or ceremony, or to

[1] Consueverunt Presbyteri Cardinales Romanum circumstare Pontificem et cum eo pariter celebrare, cumque consummatum est sacrificium de manu ejus communionem recipere. – *De Sacro Altaris Mysterio*, lib. iv., c. 25; Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, 1855, vol., 217, col. 873.

[2] *Bullarium*, Romæ, 1746, tom. I., pp. 290 and 167.

If we except the Maronites and a few other individual churches, which follow the Roman custom, the Orientals have preserved their ancient custom of having in their churches only one altar, upon which they celebrated only once a day. Benedict XIV [1] permitted the Greeks and Albanians of Italy to follow this custom in their churches, but at the same time allowed them to erect smaller altars in their churches, upon which many Masses could be celebrated daily by Latin and Greek priests.

The Greek Melchites petitioned the Holy See to be allowed to celebrate more than one Mass on the same altar in their churches on Mt. Libanus, but Benedict XIV [2] declined to grant such permission, but allowed them to erect several altars in their churches, upon which one Mass might be celebrated daily. If, however, the altars were insufficient for the number of priests who desired to celebrate, or for satisfying the pious intentions of the faithful, he permitted the custom of *concelebrating*, or of having several priests unite in offering the same Mass. When they thus celebrate each must wear the sacred vestments, recite all the prayers of the Mass, and pronounce the words of consecration, just as if he were celebrating alone. In this manner they can satisfy the obligation of celebrating for the intention of the person giving a stipend. The only vestige of this Mass in the Latin Church is at the ordination of a priest or the consecration of a bishop. In the former case, the *ordinandus* celebrates with the ordaining bishop from the offertory, but he receives under one kind only; in the latter, the *consecrandus* celebrates with the consecrating bishop from the beginning to the end of Mass, and receives under both species. This custom still obtains in the East, where there is only one church in the city, and was observed for many centuries in the West. Innocent III assures us, that in his

[1] *Etsi Pastoralis*, 1742, § vi., n. 8, 9; *Bull.*, Rome, 1746, Tom. I.
[2] *Demandatum Cœlitus*, 1743, n. 8, 9; *Bullarium*, Tom. I.

day the Cardinals concelebrated with the Roman Pontiff.[1]

To consult the wishes of those who desire to celebrate privately, the Greeks erect small chapels near the principal church. They contain each one altar, upon which one Mass may be celebrated each day. They are called *Parecclesiæ*.

Besides these important differences, many others of less note exist between the Churches of the East and West. We shall not delay in treating them. Our article, however, would be imperfect did we not add a few observations on the obligation imposed upon us of following the rite to which we belong, and make a few remarks on the communication *in divinis* between the Latins and Orientals.

VII. The different rites in the East and West and the various customs of religion which have received the approbation of the Holy See have the force of law. Consequently all the faithful are obliged to observe their peculiar rite, and can be absolved from it by the highest authority in the Church only. They are not at liberty to desert that to which they belong and pass to another without a special permission, nor is any superior allowed to permit his subjects or persuade those over whom he has no jurisdiction to change their rite, unless he has received power for such an action from the Holy See. Benedict XIV, in his Constitution "*Demandatum Nobis*" of 1743, and "*Etsi Pastoralis*" of 1742,[2] treats this obligation of adhering to one's peculiar rite with great minuteness, and shows with what care, diligence, and solicitude the Church has ever guarded and tried to preserve ancient Oriental customs. In the first-mentioned Constitution, in which he treats of the rites and customs of the Greek Melchites, (*a*) he forbids any one, be he even bishop or patriarch, to change any rite or ceremony, or to

[1] Consueverunt Presbyteri Cardinales Romanum circumstare Pontificem et cum eo pariter celebrare, cumque consummatum est sacrificium de manu ejus communionem recipere. – *De Sacro Altaris Mysterio*, lib. iv., c. 25; Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, 1855, vol., 217, col. 873.

[2] *Bullarium*, Romæ, 1746, tom. I., pp. 290 and 167.

introduce any custom that might tend to diminish their exact observance,[1] and (*b*) he reprehends the Maronite bishops for inducing the Greek Melchites to embrace their (Maronite) rite and for interfering in the spiritual affairs of the Melchite patriarch of Antioch, and forbids them and Latin missionaries to make such attempts in the future, unless by special authorization of the Roman Pontiff.[2] (*c*) He orders the Greeks, who, for want of Greek priests to perform the ceremony, had been baptized by Latin priests according to the Latin rite, to appear before the deputy, and decide to what rite it is their intention to belong. Having selected one he obliges them to adhere to it for the remainder of their life,[3] and commands that the children that would be born to them after said selection, and those that had not come to the years of discretion at the time of this decision, follow the rite of their parents, if both belong to the same rite, and if to different rites, they are to be considered as belonging to the rite which the father professes. This provision, however, was only for those cases which took place before 1743. If after that date, in case of necessity, Greeks were baptized according to the Latin rite, he decrees that such should be considered as belonging to the Greek rite.[4]

In the second Constitution mentioned above, which is addressed to the Greeks living in Italy, who are subject to the jurisdiction of Latin bishops, he again intimates the obligation imposed upon the Orientals of remaining attached to their peculiar rite, though, owing to the superiority and pre-eminence of the Latin rite, he makes special concessions for their transfer to the latter.[5] Thus (*a*) he declares that Greek clerics and entire Greek communities cannot be transferred, except by special permission of the Holy See, though he grants powers to Latin bishops to transfer in-

[1] § 3. [2] §§ 12 and 13. [3] § 17. [4] § 18.

[5] The regulations of this Constitution may be applied to all Orientals similarly situated.

dividual Greek laics.[1] (*b*) He ordains that children born of Greek parents must be baptized according to the Greek rite.[2] (*c*) If the parents are of different rites, the child must be baptized in the rite to which the father belongs.[3] If, however, the father belongs to the Greek rite, the child may with his consent be baptized according to the Latin rite.[4] (*d*) He prescribes that children are subjects of the parish priest of that rite in which they were baptized,[5] that in case of death they must be buried with the ceremonies pertaining to said rite,[6] and that they must be instructed and educated according to this rite, which, if it be the Latin, they are never at liberty to desert. This same obligation is imposed upon the Greeks that have been transferred to the Latin rite, who are not allowed to return to the Greek rite without special dispensation of the Holy See.[7] Hence a Latin husband can never follow the rite of his Greek wife, nor a Latin wife the rite of her Greek husband, but a Greek husband, if he desire, may embrace the rite of his Latin wife, and a Greek wife the rite of her Latin husband, but after his death she is not permitted to return to the Greek rite.[8]

These regulations have reference to Orientals only who are under the jurisdiction of their own bishops or of those of the Latin rite. We have seen that under peculiar circumstances they are allowed to pass over to the Latin rite. But Latins, even those who live among the Orientals, are never permitted to embrace the rites of the East. Hence Latin missionaries who are sent by the Propaganda to assist the Eastern bishops are strictly obliged to observe their own rite, and follow in everything the discipline of the Latin Church.

Finally, we shall make a few remarks concerning the communication *in divinis*, or the intercourse between Latins and Orientals with regard to the Sacraments of Penance and the Holy Eucharist. There can be no doubt that *in case of*

[1] § ii., n. 14. [2] N. 8. [3] N. 9. [4] N. 10. [5] N. 11.
[6] N. 12. [7] N. 13. [8] § viii., n. 7 and 8.

necessity the faithful can have recourse to any properly ordained priest for the reception of the Sacrament of Penance, and that a priest can absolve a penitent, whether of his own or another rite. Greek priests, therefore, can hear the confession of Latins, and Latin priests can absolve Greeks who are duly disposed. If, however, the ritual of the Orientals demands the *deprecative* form of absolution, they are obliged to make use of the *indicative* form also, proscribed by the Council of Florence, and in use at present in the Latin Church.[1] On other occasions the case assumes a different aspect. Latin missionaries sent to the East to assist Oriental bishops have the power to absolve any one, to whatever rite he may belong; an Eastern bishop cannot prevent his subjects from receiving this sacrament from the former,[2] except in *cases reserved* by the bishop. If the subjects of a bishop are of different rites they are allowed to confess to priests that have been approved by him, although they do not belong to the rite of the confessor.[3] In places in which there are bishops of different rites,[4] who have jurisdiction over the faithful of their own rite only, the faculty of hearing confession may be restricted to penitents of the confessor's rite. In such cases priests cannot absolve penitents of another rite. If, however, no restriction is made, they can hear the confessions of all that present themselves.[5]

[1] *Ego te absolvo a peccatis tuis.* Down to the twelfth century the deprecative form *Absolvat te Dominus a peccatis tuis*, or some other similar to this, was in use in the West.—*Etsi Pastoralis*, § v., n. 5.

[2] See *Instruct. S.C. de Prop. Fide ad Patriarcham. Maron. die V. Dec.* 1644.

[3] Benedict XIV gave permission to the bishops of the Latin rite in Italy to authorize Greek priests to hear the confession of their Latin subjects.—*Etsi Pastoralis*, § v., n. 6.

[4] Lemberg or Leopoli [Livow] has archbishops of the Latin, Armenian, and Greek-Ruthenian rites.

[5] In several dioceses of the United States there are congregations of Greek-Ruthenians. These are subject to the Archbishop of Lemberg in Galicia. We have not heard that our bishops have limited the jurisdiction to penitents of the Latin rite. Hence our priests are allowed to hear their confessions. Catholics of the Latin rite in this country, however, cannot be absolved by these Greek priests, as we are certain that they have not been approved by our Bishops.

With regard to the Holy Eucharist we may note that a Latin priest cannot under any consideration, even in the East, consecrate with leavened bread, nor can an Oriental priest, if we except the Maronite and Armenians, consecrate with unleavened bread. Benedict XIV [1] renewed the penalty of perpetual suspension *a divinis*, which S. Pius V in 1566 [2] had inflicted upon those who would disobey his command in this respect. So anxious and careful is the Church to keep the various rites separated, that she forbids Latin parish priests to retain in the tabernacle of their churches particles of leavened bread for the use of Greek communicants, and in like manner, Oriental parish priests to retain unleavened particles for Latin communicants, and strictly enjoins upon priests the obligation of administering this sacrament according to their own rite only.[3] As to the faithful, this same Pontiff prohibits Latin laics to receive under the species of leavened bread from Oriental priests,[4] but by special permission allows Greek communicants, in places in which there is no church of their rite, to receive from Latin priests under the form of unleavened bread.[5]

S. L. E.

PERSONAL CHARACTER OF MONSIGNOR CORCORAN.

THERE are men in whom disposition and character blend to perfection; whose convictions are identical with their feelings, and in whom nature has acted from infancy without struggle, spontaneously assuming the outward mould suggested by the play of the soul within. To look upon the face of Dr. Corcoran was without effort to receive the impression of peacefulness, benevolence, and that kind of humility which

[1] *Etsi Pastoralis*, § vi., n. 10.

[2] *Const. Providentia, Rom. Pont. Bullarium*, Romæ, 1745, Tom. iv., pars. ii., p. 309.

[3] *Etsi Pastoralis*, § vi., n. 11. [4] *Ibidem*, n. 12. [5] *Ibidem*, n. 13.

belongs to the child rather than to the ascetic. There was moreover about his person an air of purity which, like the clear, soft atmosphere of spring mornings, forbade the suggestion of that frivolity which defiles. It would have been difficult for one who looked at him to imagine that he ever committed a sin in malice of any kind, just as difficult as to fancy him to be cruel to a harmless animal. Both purity and kindness belonged to him as naturally as the pearly softness belongs to the refined wax. It was not the result of discipline or reasoned conviction. He had received innocence, like many others, as his birthright. And those to whom belonged the care of his education had guarded the child's treasure, whilst he himself, unconscious of the gain, yet docile, had learned to shun whatever could fan the lower passion into flame. Thus, when he came to the age where reason enlivened by faith made the habits of the child the duty of the youth, he found but little difficulty in keeping himself on that elevated plain the air of which his lungs had been accustomed to breathe and from which he could not have descended without a strong sensation of stifling. There were many instances when this natural shrinking from moral corruption came out in strong relief. The scandals which, in the press and elsewhere, form the stock of daily gossip, never crossed his lips. He had no words, and probably no thoughts for the things of which the Apostle writes to the Ephesians: "Let it not so much as be named among you." When questions of a delicate nature were brought before him in his capacity as moral theologian, he spoke as one might speak of things possible but not real. There was an utter absence of prudishness and of that conscious reserve which is at once suggestive of evil and yet unsatisfactory to him who seeks knowledge. As he analyzed and examined the case on its merits, his whole manner convinced you that he was a physician dissecting dead matter for a pupil who had to repeat the process—exactly so, only upon the mortified limb of a living patient, in order to save him. If any one put him a

question on such subject, through what appeared idle curiosity, he answered in a way which at once changed the current of conversation, and yet without any implied reproof or wounding of feeling. He seemed to take for granted that no man of decency would care to talk unnecessarily of such things. Once, within my recollection, he expressed a distinct loathing of foul-mouthed talk and a warning against it. It was during the year whilst he was rector of the Seminary. At the beginning of the term he gave the customary lecture upon the observance of the rules. Speaking of the necessity of avoiding in conversation as well as in action everything that could savor of vulgarity, he gradually drew towards the delicate subject. I shall never forget it: "And if," said he, "cleric or layman, any one, should dare to utter within your hearing words which should make every honorable man blush, frown him down—frown him down!" The last words rang through the chapel with such pleading emphasis, that they must have lodged deeply in the hearts of those who heard them. Often he repeated the words "Iniquitatem odio habui," and they fell from his lips with the ring of his heart in the fall.

There was one thing which Dr. Corcoran lacked, and I deem it just for a right appreciation of his character to state it here, before entering further upon the remarkable traits of his lovely disposition. He was not a man of strong native will. Perhaps it was no loss to him. Had he been a more vigorous nature, he could hardly have retained in manhood and old age that enviable simplicity which made him loved by everybody who approached him and gave to his ordinary movements and actions that charm which is so rarely retained beyond the years of early childhood. We know that with some men habit supplies character, and though it may want the forward spontaneity of inborn energy, it frequently accomplishes as much in the end. But in every case, faith—apart from mere religious sentiment—is a much stronger substitute for character than either

habit or enthusiasm. It supplies motives which are not only superior in their nature to all earthly considerations, but which acknowledge no obstacle in their way, because they rely upon omnipotence. It is quite true that the strongest in faith are often the weakest in nature, since conscious weakness is more apt than native strength to seek help out of itself; yet the man of faith will readily rise to a much higher level in the exercise of it, than the self-reliant man, whose endurance is measured by his own strength rather than by the strength of Him Who sustains the weak. Dr. Corcoran was a man of strong, unusually strong faith. The qualities of his soul were, as we have said, developed by habit in the direction which nature and religious teaching had pointed out. Intelligence and reason tested and approved in later years what the pious care of his tutors had inculcated upon the gentle heart in earlier days. Independent of the principles which had thus formed themselves into an insurmountable barrier against definitely evil influences, Dr. Corcoran was easily accessible. His guileless and generous disposition could readily be engaged in favor of the more pronounced sympathies of others. He found it difficult to refuse a request if he could grant it, even at a personal sacrifice wholly out of proportion to the reasonableness of the demand. Outside of the moral field he had hardly what men call fixed views. Only repeated experience taught him ever to use caution in his dealings with others, or to suspect any one of attempting to take advantage of him. And often when it was apparent that he was being imposed upon he preferred to submit to it rather than bring the delinquent to account, and "make trouble," as he termed it. In all things which were not sinful he accommodated himself as far as possible to the tastes and wishes as well as the needs of others. It was in this way that he sometimes sustained humiliations which were a source of regret to those who knew and loved him, because they felt that the world would put its own construction upon his actions, in-

stead of remembering the altogether different judgments of God, Who makes the weakness of a truly humble man the occasion of his merit, by the conscious humiliation which he sustains.

Of Dr. Corcoran's humility his every gesture bore witness. I have seen his beautiful head, which was a model of proportion and perfect physical development, sketched by an artist, who unwittingly gave the face an upward turn, imparting thereby a lofty and commanding attitude. That was not Dr. Corcoran. His head was bent as if in habitual deference. He had a graceful bow, as the tuberose sways in the breath of light air, in response to the slightest attention, and would give the right of way to any one whom he might meet. When passing through a crowd in which he became conscious of being noticed, he would move quickly, with a maiden-like shyness, which caught your heart at once. When treated rudely—though it seems a mystery how anyone could have been rude to him—he acted precisely as a child would have done under similar circumstances. There would be no altercation; nor did he ever affect to despise the person against whom he could not right himself with dignity. On the contrary, if he afterwards mentioned these things to a friend, it was with a sort of pouting air, generally ending by a warlike allusion to the Yankee officials; "for," he would say, "a Southern man always knows a gentleman when he meets him." But he would not allow the offender to be reproved by any one else; indeed, if it came to this, the Doctor would in all probability take up the cause of the culprit and with simple good nature disarm every attempt at quarrel.

After this it is needless to say that in his feelings and instincts as well as in his training Monsignor Corcoran was a gentleman. He could not have laid aside his courteous manner with his dresscoat. It was the natural temper of his heart, and the mind had been taught to take its lesson from the latter. The keynote of polite manners is charity.

It may miss something of the stereotyped forms, but on the whole, wherever society has not degenerated into a mere exhibition of exclusiveness and vanity, consideration for the feelings and rights of others, allied to common sense, is or should be a safe passport among the most refined. Men or women who can make the accidental violation of a mere conventionality the subject of pointing comment, lack the fibre of true gentle breeding, no matter what parlor practice may have done for them otherwise. Conscious of his own distaste for forms and ceremonies, Dr. Corcoran had no liking for "society," and rarely visited in latter year except where a social duty could not be satisfied by a polite note. At large receptions he would generally be lost, and you might find him in a corner, listening to some interested person who had drawn him aside, and apparently glad to be out of the crowd. At table, with strangers, he was usually silent, simply answering questions in his quiet way and looking as though he were a trifle uncomfortable. If requested to speak on such occasions, he would rise slowly and say a few complimentary words, audible only to those nearest to him, and then resume his seat with one of his inimitable bows towards the honored guest at the board. No one was ever displeased with him for not speaking louder or longer, for he was too good a man to be kept standing long, and if he did not say anything extraordinary, he surely could have done so, as everybody knew.

At home and among intimate friends he was different, and an air of geniality characterized his little speeches on occasion of domestic festivals. Sometimes these were held in his honor by the students, who really loved the dear old Domi, as he was called by them. There were also occasional little parties of friends who met on anniversaries in the seminary once or twice a year. At the gatherings of the clergy, he could frequently be seen surrounded by the younger generation, who had been taught by him, and who doted on his words. Among these he was really as a father,

and perfectly at home; and it was pleasant to see how one or the other would help to dress him in his purple, when "on ceremonies," or on leaving wrap him up in his cloak or shawl, with a manifest tenderness which reflected his own most amiable disposition. In a circle of friends he could be and usually was charmingly interesting. There were few topics in art, science, or letters upon which he could not discourse with ease, and his large and varied reading brought constantly to light old things and new which served as illustrations of some moral or intellectual truth. And in the same way he could readily enter into the feelings and thoughts of simple folk, or amuse himself with little children, who instinctively reciprocated his fondness for them. A bright little orphan child, left in his care during the war, tells of how he used to make her recite the catechism every day, and then, as if by way of special treat, would teach her the Hebrew letters, hoping that she might turn out to be another St. Paula. He frequently gathered pictures and little trinkets or story books in order to send them to his little pussies, as he called his favorites.

He was extremely careful not to give offence to strangers, even in matters of evident prejudice on their part. Thus, although he was accustomed to read in the railway cars, he never purchased or carried a newspaper on Sundays, saying that he felt that it was needlessly giving umbrage to a large number of people, who had, although narrow, yet strong views on the subject of Sabbath observance and patronage of liberal Sunday journals. A similar regard, although from a different point of view, frequently induced him to purchase irreligious and immoral works conspicuously displayed at the public book-stalls or sold at auction, that he might destroy them afterwards; whilst he was anxious and expended much money in the purchase of good books, which he distributed with the sole view of disseminating truth and morality.

The same spirit of intelligent charity manifested itself in

regard to the reputation of his fellows. Few men knew more of the secrets of others than he did; for, whilst his character as a priest inspired unreserved confidence on one hand, his unequalled knowledge of canon law and precedent made him a universal judge of appeal in all sorts of personal trouble and ecclesiastical litigation. He was strongly sensitive to injustice, more so indeed than most persons of his usually placid temper might be thought capable of; and when on rare occasion his indignation was called forth, it came like a thunder storm from midsummer sky. You would think no more of arguing against it than interfere by kind words with the law of gravitation in a falling rock. His rebuke would inspire silence because of the unmistakable honesty of its tone manifesting his simple hatred of iniquity, and because of a certain exalted assurance which convinced you that he based his judgment on facts. Yet he was liable to err in this. Himself incapable of deception, he did not suspect it in others. Thus it could happen that, misinformed as to facts by men who sought to enlist his sympathy, he might champion causes not in any sense his own. Beyond this, no man's character was safer than when in his hands; and I have known the conversation to turn in his presence upon persons, lauded with exaggerated praise, whose condemnation he held in his hands, yet no feature or word betraying that he thought or knew aught else than what he heard. He was ingenious, too, without seeming to be so, in favorably interpreting the short-comings of others. Good men's views grow broader, their hearts widen, and their judgments become more lenient as they grow older. Only barren natures, like poor wines, turn into vinegar instead of being sweetened and made generous by age.

He had a thousand little ways which showed his thoughtfulness about others where one would never suspect it. I may be pardoned for relating an instance from personal experience, because it shows this trait of his character better than anything else that could be said about it.—A friend and

I had resolved to spend the greater part of our vacation in reading together at the Seminary. We had rest, the library, and, what was more, the old Doctor, who could always be approached in any matter of doubt. When the time came for him to leave for a few weeks of change at the seaside he urged us also to go away and improve our health. But we thought that it would be as well for us to remain at home. Neither of us enjoyed the best of health, but then, our purses were equally poor, which I believe is a chronic evil with young professors. Whether we had in any way intimated the latter fact, or whether he had surmised it, I cannot say. Certainly we could have had no suspicion that it would make any particular impression upon the Doctor, who never had much surplus himself, partly owing to his book bills and mostly to his generosity towards periodical applicants for charity. On the day he left I found a sealed envelope upon my desk; beneath the address the following was written in pencil:

"My dear Father:— . . . . Please go into my room while I am away, and you will find a check somewhere for $200. Give it to Dr. . . . ., to whom I am a debtor for $100. I think it is near the window."

The envelope contained fifty dollars, and the following note:

"My dear Father:— . . . . Please say one Mass *at your own convenience pro animabus maxime derelictis*, and oblige yours truly,

"J. A. C."

At the foot of the note, which lies before me, I find added the following memorandum in my own hand, from which I omit the name of my friend.

"In this was enclosed a fifty dollar note. — received at the same time a like note with contents. It was a pure act of kindness on the part of J. A. C., who, I believe, wished us to take a vacation and thought we lacked the means.—The notice on the outer envelope seems to indicate that he had borrowed the money."

My companion had received a like note. This act is one out of many similar ones, and whilst it shows forth Mgr. Corcoran's exquisite charity, which was never without a delicate

regard for the feelings of those whom he sought to benefit, it is incidentally indicative of his disregard for money. To look for a check "near the window" of a room every nook and corner of which was covered with books, pamphlets, and manuscripts would have been a toilsome task if you did not know the habits of mind and the time when the check was received. The find must be determined by the methods of geologists. The last stratum of books represented the latest reading to a certain date, and the letters, unless they were important documents, and notes, even bank-notes and checks, served him as convenient book marks. For matters of money and what is commonly called "business" he had neither relish nor capacity. And whilst his conscientious views of what he owed to others made him keep minutely accurate accounts of all his money transactions, it was merely on paper and to satisfy his own sense of justice. He always paid with a punctuality which must have delighted every business-man who had dealings with him. But he never insisted on being paid, and so far depended simply on the honesty of others If through some error a bill was sent him twice, he would protest that it was paid on such and such a day, as his accounts showed; but the receipt might be buried among his books, whence such vouchers had to be periodically collected. In travelling he was rarely alone, and always left the business transactions to his companion. Even the short distance between Philadelphia and Overbrook was a serious journey when he was alone and had to purchase a ticket. He would spread out on the counter all the money he had with him to allow the agent to take out fifteen cents, and seemed very much obliged to the latter for not keeping the whole amount. Still, for all this, he would notice an error or an attempt at imposition, but he cared too little for what was involved, to show this disposition. We could multiply example of this simplicity and bigheartedness found in a man who could be and as we hope to show further on, was at the same time possessed

of keen penetration, and frequently attentive almost to a fault in little things.

THE PRIEST AND THE MEDICAL PROFESSION.

THE mutual relation of the priest and the physician, in the sense in which we propose to treat the subject, is twofold. They meet upon professional ground, and they meet likewise on moral or ethical grounds. In the first case their conduct toward each other is regulated by the rules of propriety and expediency; in the second, by the law which determines what is just and licit. The fact that the invalid whom both treat possesses a twofold nature, the psychical and the physical, both of which are so interwoven, so dependent on each other, that the condition of one invariably affects that of the other, makes it absolutely necessary for the well-being of their patient that there exist between them perfect understanding and complete harmony as to the method and limits of their respective treatment. The adage "Mens sana in corpore sano" hardly loses of its truth when inverted, and Juvenal, by a strange freak, acknowledged the claims of religion in this respect when he prefaced the phrase by the words "Orandum est ut sit."

Every unprejudiced physician will allow that the rites of the Catholic Church, as administered to the sick, have a decidedly beneficial and soothing effect upon the latter. Goethe, who had little if any practical faith in the supernatural, has left us a beautiful literary memorandum entitled "Sacraments," in which he dwells upon the wonderful power of the sacramental rites in the Catholic Church to raise man's aspirations, to strengthen his purpose, and make him superior to the ills of this life. The confession of past sins, which haunt the sick man during the sleepless hours of enforced reflection, relieves his mind. The fear of retribution, induced by the thought of possible death, turns into

hope after he has received the assurance of pardon, given, not in the form of friendly desires or pious sentiment, but as an efficacious remedy vouchsafed to man by God through the ministry of man, and always sure of being obtained so long as the sinner has a true sorrow for his offence. Thus, too, in "Extreme Unction" the prayers which the priest pronounces as he anoints the different senses of the body remind the patient that even now, though his life is in jeopardy, he need not fear. A special sacramental grace is given him when earthly remedies have been pronounced as no longer availing or greatly doubtful. Then the sincere Catholic is made to remember that, if the wisdom of God deem it for his advantage to live, he will recover in the strength of that last sacramental prayer made in the name and power of Christ; but if not, he is fortified for the trans- it into eternity. And the thought gives him peace, and the last struggle is one of hope and not of despair. If rightly understood, such disposition will be welcomed by every sensible physician.

But we would miss our purpose if we were here to pass over a disadvantage to the sick which sometimes arises out of this very confidence which it is the priest's part to elicit from those who possess the Catholic faith. The fact that priests who have made a thorough course of study in some well equipped theological seminary or at a European university are more or less familiar with the details of medical practice offers not unfrequently a temptation of interfering with the physician who is called to attend the case in which our services are likewise required. Many Catholics, too, especially the poor or those who come from districts where their religion had at one time made them an object of persecution, and who have in needful days found in the priest their only friend, their physician and true father, cling to the latter with a confidence which at times makes them disregard other legitimate claims. This kind of gratitude lies deep in the heart and lasts for a long time. Our people will send for the priest

when they should send for the doctor, or they will neglect the prescriptions of the latter when they have received the blessing of the former. All this is very good so long as it does not create misunderstanding to the detriment of the patient, or cast odium upon our ministry. The claims of the soul are indeed superior to those of the body. No man who believes in the supernatural can consistently ignore the rights of a person to have his or her spiritual wants attended to, even if it involve a temporal loss or physical evil. Hence, too, the priest may claim the right to administer to these wants when they do not involve a violation of justice on some other ground. Law and equity give him the right in this respect against arbitrary assumption of a physician who might attempt to prevent such claims to religious ministrations on the part of his patient. But we are not arguing this side of the question. As a matter of fact our rights are rarely denied us by the medical profession. In France and Italy and other parts of Europe narrow bigotry and religious hatred have sometimes made the civil authorities to deny these rights, against natural law. Not so in America, where the respect for the moral law among medical men of repute seems by all accounts higher than in Europe. What we contend for, and this precisely in the true interests of our people, is the duty of allowing the physician the exercise of his profession within his sphere. How far this obligation extends will become clear in the course of these articles. A conscientious and skilful physician acting in harmony with the priest can only tend to promote the spiritual as well as temporal welfare of the people. In many cases, too, we have to rely upon him to inform us of what should be done for the spiritual welfare of the patient, or expect from him to supply our ministration, as in the case of baptism, when we cannot perform it. And Holy Writ indicates the important position of the physician in many places: "Honor the physician for the need thou hast of him; for the Most High has created him.—The skill of the physician

shall lift up his head, and in the sight of great men he shall be praised. The Most High has created medicines out of the earth; and a wise man will not abhor them.—By these he shall cure and shall allay their pains."[1] And shortly after: "Give place to the physician; for the Lord created him: and let him not depart from thee, for his works are necessary." And how necessary prayer and the disposition of peace is in conjunction with these remedies of the physician, may be read in the same chapter of that matchless compendium of wisdom, the Book of Ecclesiasticus.

KNOWLEDGE OF MEDICINE AND THE WAYS OF USING IT.

The close connection between ailments of the body and those of the soul makes a general knowledge of remedies which can cure both quite necessary for the priest. Every sensible director of souls knows that a sound and even spirituality is next to impossible in a person affected with chronic dyspepsia, and wherever there is a symptom of heroic virtue a confessor's first question will be: How is the health? There are high fevers affecting the soul as well as the body. As these diseases are not confined to the rich, but found among the poor, and as the wholesome advice, "My child, go and see a doctor," cannot always be given without shocking sensitive natures, an ordinary familiarity with the principles of dietetic science are part of a priest's necessary intellectual equipment. In other respects, too, this will serve him. Insisting upon cleanliness in the sick-chamber, upon caution in the taking of food and observance of other general health rules, will not only hasten recovery, but enable the poor in many cases to save the expense incurred by the continuous services of the physician. In the second place, our information should cover the principal remedies to be applied in instantaneous danger. A glass of water, the cutting of a belt, prompt stoppage of profuse

[1] Ecclus. xxxviii. 1–7.

bleeding, or, on the contrary, provoking it, may save a life in cases of accident when the priest is often the first or only person to be called. Finally, we should be familiar with the symptoms of approaching death. It will guide us in the administration of the last sacraments and prove in many ways helpful to settle the affairs of the dying, who frequently rely upon us for sole guidance in their most delicate and important affairs. Of course, these things may be learned from books and are touched upon in most works on practical theology. But a good talk now and then with a sensible and experienced physician will bring it home much more effectively. Whilst we are expected to be sufficiently informed on the subject of medicine and surgery to act in cases of emergency or when there is a legitimate call upon us to do so, the disciplinary canons of the Church explicitly forbid such practice outside of necessity. This applies even to persons who, before they entered the sacred ministry, had been engaged in the practice of medicine. There are various reasons for this prohibition, and Benedict XIV, who treats of the subject very explicitly in his work "De Synodo,"[1] distinguishes between the practice of medicine and that of surgery, and between the secular and the conventual clergy, whose duty of managing hospitals and attending the wounded on the field of battle, etc., often obliges them to the exercise of the medical and surgical art. For the regular practice of medicine the priest requires the express sanction of ecclesiastical authority, which is not to be given, except where necessity, such as the absence altogether of a competent physician, or similar abnormal circumstances, require it, and even then the use of this faculty is frequently limited as to place, persons, and time. We said that there are various reasons for these restricting canons of the Church. But on the whole they have grown out of the conservative prudence which is so conspicuous a feature in ecclesiastical legislation as to have gained for the Church

[1] De Synodo Diœcesana, lib. xiii., cap. x., 1–11.

the charge of intolerance among those who see her only in a partial light. From the foregoing we draw some practical rules of conduct respecting our relations to the medical profession.

1. Never prescribe. 2. Express no opinion as to the probable issue of the disease. 3. Pass no criticism of any kind upon the physician who attends or is likely to be called in the case. 4. Give no orders affecting bodily comfort of the patient which are contrary to the physician's directions.—We do not say that these are laws admitting of no deviation. But they are rules of prudence; and we need be very certain of the issue when we attempt to violate them. Sometime ago the papers brought a sensational report concerning a young priest who had ordered the removal of a dangerously sick person from the house, where something seemed to be wanting, to the hospital. The attending physician protested on the ground that the removal might prove fatal under the then circumstances. However, the priest carried his point, and the man died.—Whether the report was exaggerated or just to the priest, who no doubt intended well for the patient, matters little; the imprudence of the act appeared plain, as it left him no means open to justify his conduct, and the odium of one such act, however well intended, fastens upon the cloth, as we say, and creates prejudice against our legitimate activity in behalf of the sick. With the above cautions scrupulously observed, it will not be difficult to place ourselves on a friendly footing with the physician who attends our patient, no matter what the religious views of the former may be. He will give us the indications of danger and advise us what can be done for the sick person and how we may approach him, in case he need be prepared for death.

We have thus far spoken only of what we called in the beginning of this paper the professional relations between the priest and the physician. There are other aspects of their position toward each other, when it becomes a question of malpractice of any kind upon the patient. Under this head

we include the use of anæsthetics to an immoderate degree, and all such operations which touch the moral law. For an open violation of the same, as in the case, for instance, of craniotomy, it may at times become our duty to lodge a protest at the door of the conscience either of the physician, or, if he be guided solely by a godless and pretended expediency, of the patient who professes the Catholic religion. Of this we hope to treat in our next issue.

THE ART OF EXPRESSION IN PAINTING.

Letters to a Religious

I.

YOU have asked me to give you a few directions on the subject of drawing the human countenance. As you have already made some progress in the art of painting, and mastered its technical portions, it seemed to me at first sufficient to refer you to some work, such as that of Sir Charles Bell, who not only treats of the anatomy of the human face, but explains what he terms "the *rationale* of those changes in the countenance which are indicative of passion." However, further reflection on the subject has convinced me that a treatise like the above-mentioned would not sufficiently serve you. For, if I rightly interpret your purpose in the study of art, it is to attain, not simply accuracy and versatility in expressing the different passions and sentiments of the soul through the human face, which is after all a mechanical acquirement, but principally to learn the secret of that manifold spiritual beauty which, though it unites with the purely animal emotions of man and thereby ennobles them, is nevertheless, in its origin and nature, distinct from and wholly superior to the latter. It is this quality in art which gives it its highest character. The old Masters understood and had seized this subtle element, sometimes by reason of their liv-

the charge of intolerance among those who see her only in a partial light. From the foregoing we draw some practical rules of conduct respecting our relations to the medical profession.

1. Never prescribe. 2. Express no opinion as to the probable issue of the disease. 3. Pass no criticism of any kind upon the physician who attends or is likely to be called in the case. 4. Give no orders affecting bodily comfort of the patient which are contrary to the physician's directions.—We do not say that these are laws admitting of no deviation. But they are rules of prudence; and we need be very certain of the issue when we attempt to violate them. Sometime ago the papers brought a sensational report concerning a young priest who had ordered the removal of a dangerously sick person from the house, where something seemed to be wanting, to the hospital. The attending physician protested on the ground that the removal might prove fatal under the then circumstances. However, the priest carried his point, and the man died.—Whether the report was exaggerated or just to the priest, who no doubt intended well for the patient, matters little; the imprudence of the act appeared plain, as it left him no means open to justify his conduct, and the odium of one such act, however well intended, fastens upon the cloth, as we say, and creates prejudice against our legitimate activity in behalf of the sick. With the above cautions scrupulously observed, it will not be difficult to place ourselves on a friendly footing with the physician who attends our patient, no matter what the religious views of the former may be. He will give us the indications of danger and advise us what can be done for the sick person and how we may approach him, in case he need be prepared for death.

We have thus far spoken only of what we called in the beginning of this paper the professional relations between the priest and the physician. There are other aspects of their position toward each other, when it becomes a question of malpractice of any kind upon the patient. Under this head

we include the use of anæsthetics to an immoderate degree, and all such operations which touch the moral law. For an open violation of the same, as in the case, for instance, of craniotomy, it may at times become our duty to lodge a protest at the door of the conscience either of the physician, or, if he be guided solely by a godless and pretended expediency, of the patient who professes the Catholic religion. Of this we hope to treat in our next issue.

THE ART OF EXPRESSION IN PAINTING.

Letters to a Religious

I.

YOU have asked me to give you a few directions on the subject of drawing the human countenance. As you have already made some progress in the art of painting, and mastered its technical portions, it seemed to me at first sufficient to refer you to some work, such as that of Sir Charles Bell, who not only treats of the anatomy of the human face, but explains what he terms "the *rationale* of those changes in the countenance which are indicative of passion." However, further reflection on the subject has convinced me that a treatise like the above-mentioned would not sufficiently serve you. For, if I rightly interpret your purpose in the study of art, it is to attain, not simply accuracy and versatility in expressing the different passions and sentiments of the soul through the human face, which is after all a mechanical acquirement, but principally to learn the secret of that manifold spiritual beauty which, though it unites with the purely animal emotions of man and thereby ennobles them, is nevertheless, in its origin and nature, distinct from and wholly superior to the latter. It is this quality in art which gives it its highest character. The old Masters understood and had seized this subtle element, sometimes by reason of their liv-

ing faith, sometimes by their burning love for the subject which they painted. Thus they were able to influence the souls of the beholders, who, by an irresistible instinct, followed in the train of those lofty aspirations which had first kindled the artist's enthusiasm. The magic power of faith and love which had moved and inspired the artist's pencil, breathed faith and love into the heart of the attentive looker on. And the painter could accomplish this, even when he neglected the correctness of form or accuracy in the delineations of his figures. For whilst the perfect execution of the latter would elicit admiration, it might do no more. It may fail altogether in moving the soul and drawing it aloft, or in creating those longings which are an indication of man's true destiny, and which it is the noblest privilege of the true artist to produce. And whilst this is, and must ever be, the ultimate purpose of the highest art, your beautiful vocation makes it not only a most fitting aim in your case, but since you possess the talent, I should also say, a duty. To dedicate the gifts and energies of your soul, the faculties of eye and hand and heart, to the service of God and the edification of your neighbor—was not this implied in the vow which you pronounced with a clear and unfaltering voice at the altar? And when you laid aside the beautiful white robe of the world, to assume with joyous readiness the simple garment of the cloister, was it not practically as if you had said: "Earth, with your vanities and flatteries I break. I have found a Spouse transcendent fair. Henceforth my thoughts, my love, the labor of my hands and head shall follow Him, working but that which His dear love approves"?—Hence, I take it, your study of art lies within or moves towards that eminently practical field which cultivates an eternal growth. Imperishable beauty, not the fleeting images of things which are but must needs pass away, is what you would cultivate; for, though the instruments with which this is done are mortal and frail—a soul immortal may produce through them everlasting effects.

However, I would not be understood to say that all painting except that which ostensibly encourages virtue and bears the impress of the loftiest ideal is henceforth to be neglected. Not so. History and portrait, genre and still life, contribute in no small degree to that aim, and so far we may class each of these as high art. I shall not, then, entirely set aside in the following sketches the consideration of anatomy and physiognomy, at least in so far as it will aid you to the perfect interpretation of that art which, as indicated above, I believe to be your principal aim, and which surely becomes your state as a Christian teacher, the art which refines the soul and is in turn refined by it.

At the risk of a too lengthy introduction, yet because I believe it will be of benefit in elucidating the general drift of these papers, let me briefly explain why the popular works, which I might otherwise have recommended to your reading, are insufficient for the purpose. Outside of the religious communities there are comparatively few persons who, neglecting fame, wealth, or other secular advantages, seek in the pursuit of art simply the greater glory of God and the edification of their neighbor. Persons who, living in the world, are influenced by such lofty aims, will hardly find a sufficient number of admirers to encourage their work. Production in art is nearly always regulated by the sentiments of the society which patronizes it. Hence writers upon the subject usually formulate their views and precepts according to the wants of their readers, that is to say, they adopt the sentiments which are most in harmony with their surroundings.

This is the reason why little beyond the technical portions of art can be learned from popular works, which, if they touch upon the spiritual characteristics of the subject at all, too often distort it in a way which jars upon the feelings of Catholics. Perhaps you will ask: But are there not a multitude of religious painters who, appreciating this high view of fine art, would require, and in all probability possess, such

a guide? No doubt there are works written by high-minded men who, like Leonardo da Vinci combining theoretical knowledge with the inborn genius that fosters practice, contain all that could be said on the subject, But on the whole such art is rarely learned from books. In most religious communities, especially those in which the fine arts were at one time almost exclusively cultivated, tradition is still the great teacher. The novice has before him the works of the earlier masters. The aspirations of both are the same. They labor in the same studio, with the same tools, with mind and heart informed alike. It is here, too, that the Christian painter, who, perchance living in and conversing with the world, has his aspirations nevertheless above it, will find that which kindles his genius into flame. Closely observing and patiently imitating the productions of those hallowed brushes; studying the lives of these men and thus entering into their feelings, motives, and aspirations; feeding his senses on the same scenes and surroundings, he finds the keynote, so to speak, of that beautiful harmony which makes the great artists of the ages of faith still our inimitable masters. The painter who would approach or rival them must go back to the past; for the deep religious sense which still pervaded the atmosphere of Southern Europe when the golden period of the fine arts had reached its culminating point, and the so-called Reformation pretended to clear up the darkness of those fruitful ages of faith, no longer holds full sway over any entire nation.

There are other books which treat of æsthetic philosophy, and where you would find the principles of that same high art which is your aim traced to the causes whence they emanate, that is, the life of the soul. But then, you told me that you did not want anything "too theological," as you playfully termed it. So I shall, as best I can, endeavor to pilot you, avoiding on the one side the Scylla of rigid anatomy and materialistic imitation in art, and on the other, the Charybdis of pure psychology. And that I may at once give you some

idea of the division of the subject and the manner in which I propose to treat it, let me indicate the steps by which we shall proceed.

Every study requires, in the first place, from him who would undertake it, that he have a complete and perfect notion of its aim and scope. We cannot hope to be successful in the acquisition of any art, unless we clearly understand the character of the object after which we strive, and know the limits within which it is to be found. Thus our first endeavor must be to ascertain—then to realize and fix upon our minds—what is to be the artist's aim in painting the human countenance. I answer at once, the aim of the true artist who paints the human countenance is, to represent therein man *endowed with moral, intellectual, and spiritual faculties.* For by reason of these faculties is he *man,* as distinct from the lower creation. Their action, therefore, must be represented upon the canvas in such a way as to produce in the beholder the impression of beauty. Why this and nothing less must be the object of the true artist in painting the human face will be explained later on. This aim at once defines the scope of the art of expression.

In the second place, every art has its precepts. They point out the means proper to reach the proposed end and to keep within the prescribed limits. Furthermore, they direct the use of these means in detail. Thus, in painting, the means to produce action in the human figure or expression of the countenance are the anatomical disposition of both, together with those subtle indications of the inner life upon the outer form which are usually noticed only by those who have studied the action of the soul itself. For whilst every one may be impressed by a portrait which speaks certain lofty sentiments or delicate movements of the soul, yet not everyone can tell wherein precisely that expression consists. It is plain, then, that precepts here must concern the soul-life as well as the variety of forms in figure or countenance, and the handling of the pigment with all the clever devices by which

the painted form expresses the wholly spiritual yet withal palpable life of the soul.

Thirdly, perfection in art requires practice. Neither the convincing knowledge of its lofty demands, nor a thorough familiarity with the principles and laws of expression, motion, color, and the many other things which contribute to effect in painting, is sufficient to produce the artist. Yet, mark, by practice I do not mean alone the continuous handling of your brush to imitate and try whatever seems most beautiful in the art which you pursue. A fair proportion of careful imitation of whatever comes actually nearest to your ideal of the beautiful in the works of others is indeed necessary, but what is equally necessary is *a constant raising and perfecting of that ideal within yourself.* The purer we are, the more healthy our spirituality is, the loftier our own aspirations are towards that transcendent Beauty of which the fairest things on earth are but a shadowy reflection—the more likely will we be to reproduce these qualities in the works of our pencil. Every thoughtful student of Fra Angelico's pictures must be impressed with the prayerful and chaste simplicity, which, like pure and warming ray, shines forth from them. But then his paintings were prayers, and hence we feel devout in their presence. His art was, as he said himself, a way of holding converse with His Divine Master. And herein we find the reason of those matchless expressions, which even in their awkward simplicity move us and fasten upon memory and heart far more deeply than the perfect models, the well balanced motion, of the figures which are exibited in the modern salons.

You see, it is in painting as it is in oratory. He who would speak effectually must have a conscious purpose and guard the limits of that purpose well. He must have by heart the grammar of his language, and regulate pause and inflection so as to make his purpose intelligible to others. His memmory, too, must be cultivated by exercise, so as to render his expression easy and graceful. But beyond all this, he

must throw into his language that nameless something which betokens deep conviction; that expression of voice which, whilst distinct and different from modulation, is nevertheless in it. No artificial pathos will ever equal the notes of real sincerity, of actual tenderness of longing, which cannot be defined, yet which are so clearly perceptible that even the dullest are rarely deceived by the most practised counterfeit.

These are our lines. In my next letter I hope to show more in detail what is the aim and scope of this art of expression in the human couctenance; how a *face* upon the canvas must possess that something which makes it a *countenance* more or less beautiful according to the form selected and the faculty principally expressed. Let this serve as an introduction to the whole. I hope to be more brief in future.

LANDMARKS IN THE STUDY OF PATROLOGY.

IN a former article we pointed out the great utility of the study of those ancient ecclesiastical writers who are commonly styled "the Christian Fathers." But as the term itself is somewhat indefinite, and there are many excellent authors of old whose teaching might serve us as model of Christian life and doctrine, yet who are not considered as belonging to the patristic school of writers, it will be necessary to explain what are the distinguishing marks of those who are properly called "the Christian Fathers." And in order to facilitate a general survey of these rich fountains of Christian lore for purposes of private study, we shall attempt to point out such literature on the subject as lies within ordinary reach of nearly every classical student.

Christian usage has from earliest times applied the term of "Fathers of the Church" to those teachers from whom the Christians in subsequent ages received not only the doctrine of Christ but its spirit as well. In this sense it

comprehends all ecclesiastical writers of acknowledged orthodoxy. Later on the use of the word was restricted. Among theologians it came to be applied principally to those writers who had distinguished themselves during the first centuries of Christianity for learning and holiness of life, and whose writings, illustrating the doctrine delivered by Christ, had received the special sanction of the Church (ecclesia docens). Erudition, which assures a correct knowledge of doctrinal facts and an intelligent appreciation of their intended bearing upon ecclesiastical discipline, is an essential requisite in a teacher of religious truth. But it is not sufficient to shield him from error when he is required to apply principle and doctrine to facts and circumstances which lie outside of the former, or when there arises an apparent conflict between the parts. There are questions which no amount of erudition can solve, but for which the heavenly virtue of prudence finds an answer. The dilemmas of the Pharisees proposed to Our Lord supply us with several examples of this wisdom, which, though sometimes found in the unlearned, is always superior to mere knowledge. An old pagan philosopher has said that those who know truth are not equal to those who love it. Love of truth is the secret of prudence, or, as the Scriptures constantly call it, of wisdom. It is holiness of life, which, added to learning, directs the latter into the path least beset with pitfalls, and, as if by an instinct, warns it against error. Where knowledge is perfect, and judgment guided by charity, the witness possessed of these qualities has every right to be trusted—at least in human affairs. In matters supernatural we need additional safeguards. The Church, who by an infused and infallible gift determines the doctrine which is of God, whenever she defines the inspired canon of the Sacred Scriptures, places the seal of unquestionable authority upon a saint when she points him out among others as a faithful witness to Christian tradition and an apt exponent of the truth committed to her care. Hence, when theologians

speak of the Christian Fathers, appealing to them for proof of the true Catholic tradition, they require these three distinctive marks, viz., learning, holiness of life, and the acknowledgment by the Church of their being apt witnesses and interpreters of the apostolic doctrine. If the Church found it necessary to protest against the teaching of a writer, as in the case of Tertullian, it would prove that he was out of harmony with the received doctrine, or that his interpretation of old teaching was novel and strange. In general the Church gives her authoritative approbation to the works of these universal teachers, by citing them in her great councils as witnesses of the doctrine which had been delivered to her by Christ. This we find to be the case at Ephesus, Chalcedon, Constantinople, Nice, and Florence. In the canons of these councils the names of the Fathers of the Church are carefully distinguished from other learned and pious ecclesiastical writers, such as Eusebius of Cæsarea, Socrates, and Rufinus. Sometimes the sovereign pontiffs have attested the lawful claim of a Father of the Church to that title in their public documents, addressed to the universal Church, regarding matters of faith or morals. In these cases the Fathers are appealed to as supporting by unanimous consent in their writings such doctrines as are being defined. Vincent of Lerins explains what is meant by the unanimous consent which the councils or sovereign pontiffs refer to, in support of their decrees. "Quidquid vel omnes vel plures uno eodem sensu manifeste, frequenter, perseveranter, vel quodam consentiente sibi magistrorum consilio accipiendo, tenendo, tradendo firmaverint, id pro indubitato, certo, ratoque habeatur." Cardinal Duperron, in his celebrated reply to James I of England, defines the unanimous consent of the Fathers as follows: Tunc unanimus consensus patrum cumulate probatus æstimari debet, cum singularum nationum eminentissimi in alicujus rei assertione conveniunt, ita ut inter illos nemo, qui semper orthodoxus semperque orthodoxis adhæsit, dissentiat."

We should say here that the Church distinguishes among these learned and saintly witnesses of her apostolic doctrine some who have excelled in the office of universal teachers. To these brightest luminaries in the chair of her great theological school of all times she accords the special rank of "Doctor Ecclesiæ." Thus we find some of the early Fathers associated with those later teachers who by their eminent erudition and skill in the sacred discipline have merited this rank of universal masters in theological science. Such were of old Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, and Gregory the Great in the West; and Athanasius, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzen, and Chrysostom in the Eastern Church.[1]

As to the precise time which should limit the age of the so-called Christian Fathers, there has been much diversity of opinion. Some maintain that it cannot be said to terminate at all, so long as the Church exists and produces men of superior learning and sanctity, whose unanimous consent in matters of doctrinal interpretation and authentic tradition may be adduced in support of certain teaching in the Catholic Church. Mœhler, whose opinion cannot be lightly set aside, strenuously defends this view in his Patrology. Whilst he admits that the nearer we approach to the time of the Apostles, the more valuable and weighty becomes the unanimous testimony of the Fathers in regard to the doctrine which they received from the contemporaries and followers of Our Lord, he nevertheless holds that, whilst uninterrupted and well authenticatcd tradition remains one of the safeguards of the evangelical truths, we must acknowledge the

[1] Others to whom the same title was given are Hilary of Poitiers, Leo the Great, Peter Chrysologus, Isidor Hispal., Peter Damian, Anselm, Bernard, Thomas, Aquinas, Bonaventure, Francis de Sales, Alphonsus Liguori in the Latin Church to which list, as commonly given, should be added the name of Beda. In the Greek Church we have the two Cyrils of Jerusalem and Alexandria. In the Chaldee Office the following saints are inserted besides the above-mentioned Doctors of the Church: Polycarp, Eustathius of Antioch, Meletius, Alexander of Jerusalem, Gregory of Nyssa, Flavian; also the Syrian Saints Ephrem, Jacob Nisib., Jacob Sarug., Isaac M., Isaac Niniv., and Maruthas.

authority of the witnesses. In his division of Christian Literature he accordingly distinguishes three periods. These are the Græco-roman epoch, which extends to the time of St. John Damascene, in the eighth century. During this period the Church assimilates to her own spirit and finally absorbs the Greek and Roman culture which she found in its perfection among the pagans. The following era he calls the Teutonic. It lasted from the eighth to the fifteenth century, during which time the conversion of the Germanic races changed the current of Christian civilization, largely affecting the Italic nations of Southern Europe. Finally, he sees in our own day a blending of the two great national elements, giving to the Church a fresh mission, by which she inspires her genius into the arts and sciences and national characteristics of all races alike.

There is another school of writers,[1] representing perhaps the more common opinion of our day, who would have the patristic age extend to the scholastic era, including St. Bonaventure and St. Thomas Aquinas among the Fathers of the Church. It is hard to see what argument other than that based on a convenient division of time would furnish a characteristic distinction between, say, St. Bonaventure and St. Alphonsus, and why the latter should be excluded from the ranks of the Fathers if we admit the former. The third opinion, according to which the patristic age terminated with the time of Gregory the Great in the Latin, and with John Damascene in the Greek Church, commends itself for several reasons. Looking upon the Church as the universal teacher of religion to-day, we still find, as in the seventh century, that all the nations group themselves around the two great divisions of the Latin and Greek Churches. One in doctrine, in their allegiance to the chief pontiff who holds

[1] Among these we may mention, as representing the latest critique, Bishop Fessler in his excellent work *Institutiones Patrologiæ*, just edited with some additions by Dr. Bernard Jungmann of Louvain.—The first volume only has so far appeared, Innsbruck, 1890.

the see of St. Peter at Rome, they are distinguished by a different discipline and liturgy, suited to their native genius and ancient traditions. Whatever influence the Teutonic races may have exercised in subsequent ages, we never speak of a Germanic Church in the sense in which the two main bodies of the East and West are looked upon. St. Anselm and Venerable Bede are simply Latin, not Germanic or English Fathers. The great patriarchial sees of Rome and the East formed the pattern of discipline, and the newly converted races, in spite of their political ascendency, accepted the form with but few changes. Hence we see no repugnance in concluding the circle of the Christian Fathers with an age which drew so marked a line through the history of Christian civilization as the decline of the Greek and Latin and the simultaneous rise of the Germanic races. As, when Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the great fathers of the Jewish race, were buried, we hear but of the children of Israel, so with the Latin and Greek Fathers the old generation with its historic mission terminates.

In connection with this subject, we feel that it will be of practical service to the student if we suggest some of the more popular and accessible sources whence the material for a systematic study of the Fathers may be drawn. In this respect we have to distinguish two classes of works. First, those that serve as an introduction and are subsidiary to the study of the patristic writings. They do not contain the works of the Fathers proper, but give their lives and character, and a list together with a more or less extended critique of their writings.[1] Some such introduction is of course necessary, but it may be found in several of those col-

[1] Such are Bellarmin's "Liber de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis;"—Dupin's principal work, "Nouvelle Bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques," 19 vol. (This work is, according to Moehler, not wholly reliable, and has been severely criticised by Bossuet);—Moehlers "Patrologie oder Christliche Literargeschichte," edit. Reithmeyer, 1840 (This has been translated into French, but unfortunately covers only the first three centuries);—Fessler's "Institutiones Patrologiæ," edit. Jungmann, Oenip., 1890, vol 1.

lections which contain the choice writings of the Fathers. It is to this second class of patristic works that we would principally call attention. It would be impossible to enumerate all the works which lay claim to merit in this branch; nor is it our purpose to give a catalogue of these writings, which may be found in the first pages of almost every "Introduction to Patrology." We merely select a few works, different each from the other in character, and suitable to different minds and dispositions. Some for the systematic student, others of a kind which rather tend to foster a taste for the habitual study of the Fathers, and help the preacher, the catechist, or the thoughtful reader of solid lore.

Bibliotheca Manualis Ecclesiæ Patrum complectens illorum vitæ et gestorum Breviarium, Operum Synopsis, Illustriora Testimonia, Dogmata, Mores, Disciplinam spectantia et selecta Vitæ Spiritualis Documenta. A Petro Josepho Tricaletio. 15 vol.

This work, originally written in French, was soon after translated into Latin, which fact itself speaks greatly for its merit; although, strange to say, nearly a century passed between the first and second edition. I know of no better work on this subject, at least for practical use to the average priest or student. The author was a man of great erudition and a saintly priest whose labor was sanctified by almost continuous sufferings of ill health. As professor of theology and superior of a great theological seminary he had learned at once to measure and to supply the need of ecclesiastical students in regard to the study of the Fathers. The work is such in its method and style as to inspire a relish for the subject to the novice, and it covers the entire ground.

Thesaurus Patrum Floresque Doctorum qui cum in Theologia tum in Philosophia olim claruerunt, hoc est, Dicta, Sententiæ, et Exempla ex SS. Patribus probatissimisque scriptoribus collecta et per locos communes distributa, cura et opera plurimorum rebus sacris addictorum. 7 vol. This contains an excellent dictionary of "Common Places" gathered from the fathers.

Introductio ad SS. Patrum Lectionem, qua eorum tempora, vita, opera, operumque præcipuæ editiones et concionandi modus et prædicandi præcepta describuntur, auctore A. B. Caillon, S.J., 3 vol., is specially adapted to the use of preacher and catechist. Of similar character is—

Bibliotheca manualis concionatoria ordine alphabetico digesta sententiis patrum illustrata, etc. Auctore Tob. Lohner. 5 vol.

The Paris edition, 1869, is a very good one and has an opusculum added at the end: Instructio practica de munere concionandi, exhortandi, et catechizandi. The foregoing works are rendered doubly useful, if to any one of them the student adds—

SS. Patrum opuscula selecta, edited by Father Hurter; they contain the choice writings of the Fathers in neat little volumes, which one can easily force into the corner of a full gripsack, or thrust into a side pocket for handy use during a ramble. The indefatigable Jesuit theologian has during the last twenty years issued more than fifty of these opuscula in a cheap and handy form, with a view of creating a greater taste for the writings of the Fathers.[1] The most complete edition of the Fathers is that of the Abbé Migne. It makes by itself a large library. The texts are accurate and accompanied by critical references and good indexes. The entire work contains 382 volumes, 220 of which are devoted to the Latin, the rest to the Greek writers. The full title of the work is: *J. P. Migne, Patrologiæ cursus completus seu Bibliotheca universalis omnium SS. Patrum Scriptorumque Ecclesiasticorum. Series Latina, tomi* ccxx. *Series Græca, tomi* clxii.

Of English editions, such as there are, we might mention *The Ante-Nicene Library of the Fathers*, which reaches up to the beginning of the fourth century.[2] The translated works

[1] There are two editions, differing somewhat in size. They average from 20 to 30 cents a volume, and can be obtained separately.

[2] Ante-Nicene Library; Translations of the writings of the Fathers down to A. D. 325. Edited by Rev. Alexander Roberts, D.D. and James Donaldson, LL.D.—Edinburgh, 1867.

of St. Augustine come to us from a similar source.[1] Of the "Confessions" and the "City of God" there are various translations of different merit. Then we have the *Library of the Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church anterior to the division of the East and West*, translated by members of the English Church. It contains the writings of Saints Athanasius, Augustine, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Cyprian, the two Saints Cyril, Ephrem, Gregory the Great,[2] Irenæus, Justin Martyr, together with Tertullian. The set is complete in 44 volumes. The above translations, although they were made by Protestants, are on the whole faithful and intelligible. It was probably the former quality which induced Dr. Schafa to make a fresh attempt at translating. Those who were capable of understanding the original can easily convince themselves of—whether it be through ignorance or malice—many mistranslations in the work of the latter. It is to be somewhat regretted, although it can easily be explained, that we have only partial versions in English of the writings of the Fathers, which ecclesiastics among us are generally capable of reading in the original. Father Coleridge has given us an old English version of the Dialogues of St. Gregory the Great. A great number of useful dogmatic selections from the Fathers of the first five centuries may also be found in *Walworth's Faith of Catholics*, of which a new edition was printed a few years ago in this country.

[1] The works of Aurelius Augustine, Bishop of Hippo. Edit. by Rev. M. Dodd, M. A. Edinburgh, 1872.

[2] Morals on the Book of Job.

IGNORANCE OF A RESERVED CASE ON THE PART OF THE PENITENT.

Qu. A penitent comes to me and inquires: "Father, in your sermon, yesterday, you said that those who marry before a Protestant minister incur the penalty of excommunication. This I never knew, being under the impression that it was the same as being married before a justice of the peace."—I explain that, as marriage is a sacrament of the Church, a public denial of one's faith in regard to it means separation from her fold; also, that in such a case recourse must be had to the bishop for the purpose of obtaining absolution, marriage before a Protestant minister being a "reserved case." Later on the same subject comes up for discussion among a number of priests. Some of them maintain that there is no "reservation" in this case, because the errant party was ignorant of the fact that the offence was reserved. Is this view correct, and could I absolve such parties without recourse to the bishop for the purpose?

The affirmative answer, viz., that a confessor has the right of absolving the penitent in the given case, without having recourse to the bishop, is perfectly justifiable, and meets what is called a "sententia probabilis" among eminent theologians. In making this answer, we prescind for a moment from what may be the expressed or implied interpretation of the diocesan bishop in regard to this particular reservation, which is indeed indicated by the late Plenary Council of Baltimore for all the dioceses which were represented by it,[1] yet in such a way as to leave each bishop separately responsible for its application and interpretation.

The terms of the Decree plainly state that there is a censure attached to this reservation: Quod si in propria Diœcesi ita deliquerint, statuimus eos ipso facto innodatos esse excommunicatione, quæ, nisi absque fraude legis alium

[1] Item decernimus Catholicos, qui coram ministro cujuscumque sectæ a-Catholicæ matrimonium contraxerint vel attentaverint, extra propriam diœcesim, in quolibet statu vel territorio sub ditione præsulum qui huic concilio adsunt vel adesse debent, excommunicationem incurrere Episcopo reservatam, a qua tamen quilibet dictorum Ordinariorum sive per se, sive per sacerdotem ad hoc delegatum absolvere poterit. Quod si in propria diœcesi ita deliquerint, statuimus eos ipso facto innodatos esse excommunicatione, quæ, nisi absque fraude legis alium Episcopum adeant, eorum Ordinario reservatur.—Conc. Plen. Balt. III., Tit. IV., n. 127.

episcopum adeant, eorum ordinario reservatur.—The reservation has evidently the character of a punishment or penalty. But it is a principle in morals that *ignorantia pœnæ excusat ab ea incurrenda.* And if the censure or penalty is not incurred, then the reservation likewise ceases, since its principal object was that the punishment might be properly enforced. Sublata censura neque peccatum est reservatum, quia sublato reservationis objecto, jam peccatum non manet reservatum. It may be objected that the reservation is here indeed attached to the censure, but the latter is not necessarily the cause or the principal end of the former. Even so. By the fact that the censure and the reservation go together the latter participates in the nature of a punishment, and unless the contrary be in some way made clear by a distinction, such would be the natural inference. As a matter of fact, some of our bishops have made this distinction, by explicitly stating that the above mentioned reservation binds in their dioceses also those who were ignorant of it. This we take to be a proof that in their opinion the reservation in its original form was, to say the least, doubtful in its application to the ignorant. But a doubtful reservation is no reservation. Whence we legitimately draw the conclusion, that it does not affect those who were not aware of the fact that their sin was reserved. Finally we may argue that, as already intimated above, this opinion is admitted as at least probable. But a probable opinion in matter of right (not of fact) supplies probable jurisdiction. Hence the confessor in the above case acts within his right by giving absolution from a sin otherwise reserved to the bishop.

In practice it is to be remembered that it is the bishop who reserves a case in his diocese. If so, he is also the interpreter of the sense of the reservation. Consequently, if the bishop holds a view other than or contrary to the one

which we here advocate simply on the grounds of reason and authority, there can be no further question of private views or speculation, so far as the confessors of his diocese are concerned.

We have said that this reservation is penal, because of the censure with which it is connected. A large number of theologians, together with St. Alphonsus, hold, that the majority of reservations are *not penal*, but principally *medicinal*, unless the terms express or plainly imply otherwise. Hence episcopal reservations have in general been looked upon, not as punishments, but as disciplinary measures to secure a remedy for some moral evil. In this sense they would lose the character of censures, and accordingly bind all who are guilty of the sin, whether they were conscious of the reservation or not. Lehmkuhl thinks that under these circumstances we must assume that bishops, when they formerly made a reservation, really intended to act upon this more common view, and to comprehend the ignorant under the reservation, unless there be some positive evidence that they differed from the accepted opinion, which St. Alphonsus calls the *communior sententia*. But since then the matter has been much controverted, and the prevalent teaching of today is in the line of our first argument. Where the latter opinion is taught with the knowledge of the bishop, and he does not signify his disapproval, there it can be safely followed. "Quando vero, Episcopo sciente et non reclamante, alicubi docetur sententia, secundum quam ignorantia a reservatione excuset: id haberi debet pro sufficienti signo voluntatis Episcopi, quod nolit ignorantes ligare." [1]

We see no reason for entering into the question of whether ordinary episcopal reservations are mainly medicinal, that is, intended to act as a remedy, or whether they are at the

[1] Lehmk., Theol. Mor., Vol. II., n. 407, 5.

same time essentially penal in their character. We believe that there are reservations which may have in no wise the nature of a punishment, but are simply restrictive measures for the guidance of the bishop in the regulation of general discipline. That such reservations include also those who are ignorant of the restriction, there can be no doubt. But with regard to other reservations, which are mixed in their character, and serve partly as a punishment and are likewise intended as a check, many who maintain that they bind every one who is guilty of the offence to which the reservation is attached, adduce the principal argument of St. Alphonsus, namely, that the *reservation means limitation of the power of the confessor to absolve.* We answer, with Ballerini, that this is true. But it does not define the nature of the case to which the reservation extends. We might say with equal force: The law has the power of binding. Unquestionably. But the principle does not demonstrate that such or such particular instance comes under said law. Surely, the reservation does not end with the power of the confessor. It has some object, and it is precisely the nature of the object which must determine whether or not it comes under that power. Against the view of St. Alphonsus there is very weighty authority. The Salmanticenses, Lugo, Sanchez, and others equally respectable have held the opposite as a "sententia probabilis." And what is more, it is being taught to-day in the best theological schools. Dr. Checchi, professor of Moral Theology at the Propaganda and Dean of the Pontifical Seminary, strongly maintains it.[1] Yet, whilst on theological grounds the view that a reservation, *unless its terms are limited*, inasmuch as it bears a penal note, is applicable only to those who are aware of the fact that the offence is reserved, we have already stated what is to be done *where the bishop's views are known or may be gathered from circum-*

[1] It seems to have been more or less the prevalent view there. The learned Gabriel Beati, two hundred year sago, defended the same thesis.—Cf. Gury-Ballerini, Tom. II., 571, b, edit. quint., Rom.

stances. For he is both legislator and interpreter of his laws. Where a confessor is in practical doubt, we repeat what was said in the beginning, he may avail himself of two principles: A doubtful reservation is no reservation. And: A probable opininion *in re juris* gives probable jurisdiction—which, if it be wanting, *Ecclesia supplet.*

In the present state of the controversy on the subject, the suggestion of the Provincial Council of New York is of practical value: Casuum reservatio non raro confessariis anxietatem generat et scrupulos, eo quod vel terminis non omnino claris expressa fuerit reservatio, vel quia dubium adest annon ea propter causas aliquas theologicas fuerit sublata. Hujusmodi incommodo mederi posse censemus: . . . . hæc distincte enumerando, et lucide describendo, in documento, quo confessariis facultates tribuit Episcopus; *in hoc etiam exprimendo certas circumstantias et conditiones,* sub quibus, *ex intentione superioris,* peccatum non reservaretur. [1]

In conclusion we would advert to a fact which may occur in connection with this matter. It is not impossible that baptized Catholics, far removed from priest or church, lose all practical sense of their religious obligations. When they or their children come to be married they frequently desire to have the act solemnized by some religious ceremony, and they not unfrequently believe that on such an occasion some minister is better than none; especially if the latter happen to be at the same time the local magistrate. This view is in fact prevalent in some parts of Protestant Germany, where the law obliges the children of mixed marriages to be trained some in the father's and some in the mother's religion. In such a case there can hardly be a question of reservation, since the parties did not consider that they were committing a grievous sin, which latter condition is required for every reservation.

[1] Conc. Prov. Neo Ebor. IV., art. xvi.

OFFICES OF TITULARS IN THE UNITED STATES.

AUGUST.

I.—ST. ALPHONSUS LIGORIO (AUGUST 2).

(*Twenty-eight Churches in* 1888.)

Aug. 1, Vesp. de seq. Nulla com.

Pro Clero Romano, idem. Fest. S. Stephan. figend. 24 Aug. quando de eo hoc anno fiet ut simplex, et 12. Sept. fiet de Oct.

2, Sabb. *Alb.* S. Alphons. M. de Ligorio, Ep., C. D., Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. ut in Calend. sine lect. et com. S. Mart. In 2. Vesp. com. Dom. et Invent. S. Stephan.

Pro Clero Romano, ut supra. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. Dom. et Invent. S. Steph.

3, Dom. 10. post Pent. *Alb.* De ea Semid. ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. post com. S. Steph. omiss. Suffr. Prec. et or. *A cunctis.* Vesp. de seq. com. Dom. Inv. S. Steph. et Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. post com. S. Steph.

Fer. 2, 3, 4, 5, et 6. ut in Calend. pro utroq. Clero cum Cr. et com. Oct. in Vesp. Laud. et Miss. et omiss. Suffr. Prec. et or. ad libit. Fer. 6.

8, Vesp. de seq. (ut in 1 Vesp.) com. præc. et S. Romani.

Pro Clero Romano, idem. Fest. S. Emigd. figend. 7. Sept. nisi jam anterius fixum.

9, Sabb. *Alb.* Octava S. Alphons. Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Sollicitissime* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Luceat* vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. et com. Vig. et S. Roman. in Laud. et Miss. ut in fest. Evgl. Vig. in fine Vesp. de seq. com. præc. et Dom.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

II.— ST. DOMINIC (AUGUST 4).

(*Twenty-two Churches in* 1888).

Aug. 3, Vesp. de seq. m. t. v. Nulla com.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.

4, Fer. 2. *Alb.* S. Dominici C. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. ut in

Calend. cum Cr. In 2. Vesp. com. seq.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

Fer. 3, 4, 5, 6. ut in Calend. pro utroq. Clero cum Cr. et com. Oct. in Vesp. Laud. et Miss. et omiss. Suffr. Prec. et or. ad libit. fer. 6.

8, Vesp. a cap. de Oct. com. præc. et S. Roman.

Pro Clero Romano, Vesp. de seq. com. præc. Oct. et S. Roman.

9, Sabb. *Alb.* de die 6. infr. Oct. Semid. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Bene* vel ex Breviar. *Ad sancti.* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Constringenda* vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. de hom. et com. Vigil. et S. Roman. in Laud. et Miss. ut in fest. cum Evgl. Vig. in fine Vesp. de seq. com. Dom. tant.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. tant. in Laud. et Miss.

10, Dom. *Rub.* S. Laurentii ut in Calend. cum Cr. sed sine com. Oct. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. (ut in 1. Vesp.) Dom. et SS. Mart.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra. Fest. S. Xysti figend. 7 Sept. nisi jam anterius fixum.

11, Fer. 2. *Alb.* Octava S. Dominic. Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. Incip. Lib. Eccles. (ex heri). 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Gaudete* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Si istum* vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. et com. SS. Mart. (post. com. Oct.) in Laud. et Miss. ut in fest. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc. et Oct. S. Laur.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

III.—OUR LADY OF SNOW (AUGUST 5).

(*One Church in* 1888).

This feast has a special octave in the Octavarium. Should the priests who may have to celebrate it in this country not be provided with that book, they can construct the Octave according to the rules given in the January number of the Review. reciting the proper on the day and on the octave, and the common of the B. V. on the 9th and 11th, which are the 5th and 7th within the Octave, and commemorating the Octave on the other days, the feast of St. Lawrence excepted. The feast of St. Clara, on the 12th, is to be fixed for the common Calendar on the 13th, and for the Roman on September 7th, unless it should have been already fixed on a previous date.

IV.—THE TRANSFIGURATION OF OUR LORD (AUGUST 6).

(*Nine Churches in* 1888*: eighteen under the title of the Redeemer, five of the Good Shepherd, one of the Gesu, one of Emmanuel, one of the Atonement, all to be celebrated on the 6th of August, unless in the case of a special concession.*)

Aug. 5, Pro utróq. Clero Vesp. de seq. Nulla com. Doxol. propr. per tot. Oct.

6, Fer. 4. *Alb.* Transfigur. D. N. J. C. Dupl. 1. cl. cum Oct. ut in Calend. sine lect. et com. SS. Mart. Ad prim. *Qui apparuisti* et Præf. Nativ. per tot. Oct. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. tant.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

Fer. 5. et 6. pro utroq. Clero ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. in Vesp. Laud. et Miss. in qua Cr. et omiss. Suffr. Prec. et or. ad libit. fer 6.

8, Vesp. a cap. de Oct. com. Præc. et S. Roman.

Pro Clero Romano, Vesp. de seq. com. præc. Oct. et S. Roman.

9, Sabb. *Alb.* de die 4. infr. Oct. Semid. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. et 3. Noct. vel propr. ex Octavar. vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. de hom. et com. Vigil. et S. Roman. in Laud. et Miss. ut in fest. cum Evgl. Vig. in fine Vesp. de seq. com. Dom. tant.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. tant. in Laud. et Miss.

10, Dom. *Rub.* S. Laurent. ut in Calend. cum Cr. sed sine com. Oct. nisi in Vesp.

Pro Clero Romano, idem, sed sine com. Oct. in 2. Vesp.

11, Fer. 2. de die 6. infr. Oct. Semid. ut in Calend. et Sabb. præc. 9. Lect. et com. SS. Mart. in Laud. et Miss. (post. com. Oct. S. Laur.) omiss. or. *Concede.* Vesp. de seq. com. 2. Octt.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. ante Oct. St. Laur. et Cr.

12, *S. Claræ* Dupl. ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. ante com. S. Laur. et Cr. Vesp. de seq. (ut in 1 Vesp.) com. præc. Oct. S. Laur. et SS. Mart.

Pro Clero Romano, idem—Fest. S. Vinc. a Paulo ulterius figend. 7. Sept. nisi antehac prius fixum.

13. Fer. 4. *Alb.* Octava Transfigur. Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. de

Script. occ. 2. et 3. Noct. vel propr. ex Octavar. vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. et com. SS. Mart. in Laud. et Miss. (post. com. S. Laur.) ut in fest. In 2. Vesp. com. S. Laur. et S. Euseb.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. S. Laur. et S. Euseb.

V.—ST. LAWRENCE (AUGUST 10).

(*Fifty-five Churches in* 1888; *some of them may have for Titular St. Lawrence O'Toole.*)

Aug. 9, Pro utroq. Clero Vesp. de seq. com. Dom. tant.

10, Dom. 11. post. Pent. *Rub.* S. Laurent. Mart. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. ut in Calend. per tot. Oct. nisi quod dicit. Cr.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.

VI.—ST. PHILOMENA (AUGUST 11).

(*Fourteen Churches, among which the Cathedral of Omaha, in* 1888.)

For the Roman office the feast of St. Philomena is fixed on Sept. 3, when those who have the privilege of the Roman Calendar should celebrate it as Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. About the date of this feast, see "The Pastor," III., pp. 133, 134.

Aug. 10, Vesp. de seq. com. præc. tant.

Pro Clero Romano, nihil de S. Philumena tota hac Oct.

11, Fer. 2. *Rub.* S. Philumenæ, V. M., Dupl. 1. cl. com. Oct. off. de com. V. M. Lectt. 1. Noct. *Confitebor* 2. et 3. Noct. de com. 1 loc. Missa *Loquebar* cum Gl. et Cr. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. tant.

12, S. Claræ ut in Calend. cum com. Octt. S. Philum. et S. Laur. Lectt. 1. Noct. Incip. lib. Eccles. ex Dom. præc.

13, Fer. 4. *Rub.* de 3. die infr. Oct. Semid. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Ego licet* vel ex Breviar. *Nunc nobis.* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Hanc Parabolam* vel ex Breviar. *Dominus.* 9. Lect. et com. SS. Mart. post com. S. Laur. in Laud. et Miss. fest. Cr. In 2 Vesp. com. oct. S. Laur. et S. Euseb.

14, Fer. 5. de 4. die infr. Oct. semid. ut heri Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Cum in* vel ex Breviar. *Quoniam.* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Quam* vel ex Breviar. *Sæpe.* 9. Lect. de Vigil. com. S. Laur.

Vigil. et S. Euseb. in Laud. Miss. de Vig. 2. or. S. Philum. 3. S. Laur. 4. S. Euseb. Vesp. de seq. sine com.

15, Nihil de Octava.

16, Tit. com. Octt. Assumpt. S. Philum. except. Vesp. et S. Laur. etiam in Vesp.

17, Nihil de Octt. Assumpt. et S. Philum. in Laud. et Miss. In 2. Vesp. com. Oct S. Philum. (ut in 1. Vesp.) dici octav. S. Laur. Dom. Oct. Assumpt. et S. Agapit.

18, Fer. 2. *Rub.* Octava S. Philum. Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *De virginibus inquit* vel ex Breviar. *Nunc nobis.* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Intendat* vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. et com. S. Agap. (post com. Assumpt.) in Laud. et Miss. ut in fest. cum Præf. Assumpt. In 2. Vesp. com. Oct. Assumpt.

VII.—ST. CLARE (AUGUST 12).

(*Twelve Churches in* 1888.)

Aug. 11, Pro utroq. clero Vesp. de seq. Nulla com.

12, Fer. 3 *Alb.* S. Claræ V. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. Lectt. 1. Noct. *De virginibus* Miss. *Dilexisti* cum Cr. sine com. Oct. In 2. Vesp. nulla com.

Pro Clero Romano, ut supra. In 2. Vesp. com. seq.

13, Fer. 4. *Alb.* de 2. die infr. Oct. Semid. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ex Breviar. *Quoniam hodie.* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Notandum* vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. et com. SS. Mart. (post. com. S. Laur.) in Laud. et Miss. Cr. In 2. Vesp. com. S. Laur. et S. Euseb.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. ante Oct. S. Laur. et Cr.

14, Fer. 5. de 3. die infr. Oct. ut heri. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Ego licet* vel ex Breviar. *Nunc nobis.* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Hanc parabolam* vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. de Vig. Assumpt. com. S. Laur. Vig. et S. Euseb. in Laud. Miss. de Vig. 2. or. S. Claræ. 3. S. Laur. 4. S. Euseb. Vesp. de seq. sine com.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. et Cr.

15, Nihil de Octava.

16, Fit com. Octt. Assumpt. et S. Clar. except. Vesp. et S. Laur.

de qua etiam in vesp. (ut in 1. Vesp.)—De die Oct. S. Laur. hoc anno fit ut simplex.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. Octt. ut supra.

17, Nihil de Octt. Assumpt. et S. Clar. in Laud. et Miss. In 2. Vesp. com. diei Octav. S. Laur. Dom. Oct. Assumpt. et S. Agap.

Pro Clero Romono, in 2. Vesp. com. seq. diei Oct. S. Laur. Dom. et S. Agap.

18, Fer. 2. *Alb.* De Oct. Assumpt. ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. S. Clar. ante com. S. Mart. Vesp. de seq. (ut in 1. Vesp. fest. com. Oct).

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. 2. Octt. Vesp. a cap. de seq. (ut in 1. Vesp.) com. præc. et Oct.—Fest. B. Urban. perpet. figend. 7. Sept. nisi jam ante fixum.

19, Fer. 3. *Alb.* Octava S. Claræ. Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. et 3. Noct. ex Octavar. ut in Oct. S. Philum. (vd. supra.) vel ut in fest. Com. Oct. Assumpt. in Laud. et Miss. ut in fest. cum Cr. et Præf. Assumpt. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc. et Oct. Assumpt.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

VIII.—ASSUMPTION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN (AUGUST 15).

(*In* 1888, *one hundred and two Churches dedicated to this title, among which the cathedral of Louisville; seven hundred and thirty-eight to St. Mary, among which the cathedrals of San Francisco, Cheyenne, Covington, Galveston, Ogdensburg, Peoria, Trenton; and one to Our Lady of Loretto.*)

Per totam Octavam Officium et Missa ut in Calend. pro utroque Clero.

IX.—ST. HYACINTH (AUGUST 16).

(*Six Churches in* 1888.)

Aug. 15, In 2. Vesp. com. seq.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.—Fest. S. Rochi permanent. mutand. in 18. August.

16, Sabb. *Alb.* S. Hyacinth. C. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. m. t. v. Lectt. 1. Noct. *Justus.* Reliq. ut in Calend. sine com. In 2.

Vesp. com. seq. Oct. S. Laur. (ut in 1. Vesp.), de qua hoc anno fit ut simpl. et Dom.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

17, Nihil de Oct. S. Hyacinth.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.

18, Fit de Oct. Assumpt. cum com. Oct. S. Hyac.

Pro Clero Romano, S. Rochi (fix. ex. 16. præc.) ut in Calend. ista die cum com. Oct. S. Hyac. loco Oct. S. Laur. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc. et Oct.

Fer. 3, 4, 5, et 6. pro utroq. Clero ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. omiss. fer. 3. or. Eccl. vel pro Papa.

22, In 2. Vesp. com. seq. (ut in 1. Vesp.) fest.—Fest. S. Philip. Benit. permanent. mutand. in 26. August.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.—Fest. S. Philippi figend. 7. Sept. nisi jam anterius fixum.

23, Sabb. *Alb.* Octava S. Hyacinthi Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Gaudete* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Si istum* vel ut in fest. com. et Evgl. Vig. in fine. Vesp. de. seq. com. præc. 9. Lect. de hom. Vigil. et hujus com. in Laud. et Miss. fest. cum Præf. et Dom.

Pro Clero Romano, ut supra. Vesp. de seq. com. præc. et Dom.

X.—ST. ROCH (AUGUST 16).

(*Two Churches in* 1888.)

Aug. 15, In 2. Vesp. com. seq. or. *Adesto.*—Fest. S. Hyacinth. permanenter mutand. in 26. Augusti.

Pro Clero Romano, idem. or. pr.

16, Sabb. *Alb.* S. Rochi C. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. Off. C. non P. 2. loc. Lectt. 1. Noct. *Beatus.* 2. Noct. *Deridetur.* 3. Noct. *Nolite timere.* Miss. *Justus* sine com. Cr. Præf. Assumpt. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. etc. ut in fest. S. Hyac. supra.

Pro Clero Romano, ut supra nisi ubi habentur propria ut in fine Breviar.

Dies infr. Oct. ordinandi sunt ut in Oct. S. Hyacinth. Fest. S. Philip. Benit. permanent. mutand. in 1. Sept. *Pro Clero Romano,* in 7. Sept. nisi jam prius fixum.

23, Octava S. Rochi (Cf. Oct. S. Hyac.) Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Gaudete* vel ex Breviar. *Justus*. Reliq. ut in Oct. S. Hyac. supra.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.

XI.—ST. JOACHIM (AUGUST 17).

(*Fourteen Churches in* 1888).

Aug. 16, Pro utroq. Clero Vesp. de seq. m. t. v. com. Oct. S. Laur. (ut in 1. Vesp.) et Dom. tant.—De Oct. S. Laur. fit ut simplex.

17, Dom. *Alb.* S. Joachim C. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. ut in Calend. In 2. Vesp. omit. com. S. Agap.

Pro Clero Romano, ut supra. In. 2. Vesp. com. seq. diei Oct. S. Laur. et Dom. tant.

Per tot. Oct. pro utroq. Clero ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. in Vesp. Laud. et Miss. et Cr. die 23. omiss. die 18. or. de Spir. S. et die 19. or. Eccl. vel pro Papa.

23, Vesp. de seq. com. Oct. (ut in 1. Vesp.) præc. et Dom.—De Octava fit ut simplex.

Pro Clero Romano, Vesp. de seq. (ut in 1. Vesp.) com. præc. et Dom.—Fest. Purissim. Cord. B. M. V. hoc anno omittitur.

24, Dom. S. Bartholomæi Dupl. 2. cl. ut in Calend. cum com. diei Oct. S. Joach. in Laud. et Vesp.

Pro Clero Romano, de die Octava S. Joachim, Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. Incip. lib. Eccli. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. (de com.) *Gaudete* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ut in fest. 9. Lect. de hom. et com. Dom. in Laud. et Miss. ut in fest. Vesp. de seq. com. præc. et Dom.

XII.—ST. HELEN (AUGUST 18).

(*Five Churches in* 1888).

Aug. 17, Vesp. de seq. or. *Exaudi* com. præc. tant.

Pro Clero Romano., idem—Fest. S. Hyacinth. ulterius perpetuo mutand. in 7. Sept. nisi jam antea fixum.

18, Fer. 2. *Alb.* S. Helenæ. Vid. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. Omnia

de com. nec Virg. nec Mart. Nulla com. Cr. per tot. Oct. Præf. Assumpt. In 2. Vesp. nulla com.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

Pro utroq. Clero per tot. Oct. ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. in Vesp. Laud. et Miss. except. Fest. S. Bartholom.

24, In 2. Vesp. com. Oct. (ut in 1. Vesp.) et Dom.—Fest. S. Ludovic. perpetuo mutand. in diem sequent.

Pro Clero Romano, Vesp. de seq. com. præc. et diei Oct. S. Helen. de qua fit ut simplex.

25, Fer. 2. *Alb.* Octava S. Helen. Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. Incip. lib. Eccli. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Duplicia* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Ideo* (de Mart. non. Virg.) vel ut in fest. In Miss. fest. Præf. com. In. 2. Vesp. com. seq. m. t. v. et S. Zephyr. Mart.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. diei Oct. S. Helen. in Laud. et Missa. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. et diei Oct.

26, S. Ludovic. (fix. ex heri) ut in die propria. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. Com. S. Zephyr. in Laud. et Miss. in qua 3. or. *A cunctis*. Vesp. de seq. com. præc.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend.

XIII.—ST. BERNARD (AUGUST 20).

(*Fifty-five Churches in* 1888.)

Aug. 19, Vesp. de seq. Nulla com.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.

20, Fer. 4. *Alb.* S. Bernardi C. D. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. ut in Calend. Lectt. 1. Noct. *Sapientiam* omitt. com. Oct. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. tant.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

Fer. 5. 6. Sabb. Dom. 2. ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. in Vesp. Laud. et Miss. except. Fest. S. Bartholom. Pro Calend. commun. fer. 5. Incip. lib. Sapientiæ.

25, Vesp. a cap. de Oct. com. præc. (sine Suffr. et Prec.)

Pro Clero Romano, nihil de Oct.

26, Fer. 3. de 7. die infr. Oct. Semid. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ex. Octavar. *Cum nobis* vel ex Breviar. *Qui post.* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Si autem* vel in fest. 9. Lect. et com. S.

M. in Laud. et Miss. fest. cum 3. or. *Concede et* Cr. Vesp. ut in 1. Vesp fest.—Fest. S. Jos. Calas. perpetuo mutand. in 1. Sept.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. et Cr. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc.--Fest. S. Jos. Calas. perpet. mutand. in 7. Sept. nisi jam anterius fixum.

27, Fer. 4. *Alb.* Octava S. Bernard. Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. et. 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Sollicitissime* et *Luceat* vel ut in fest. Præf. com. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc. et S. Hermetis.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

XIV. SACRED HEART OF MARY.

(*Twenty-three Churches in* 1888, *under this or an equivalent title.*)

As the feast of the Most pure Heart of the B. V. M. is only granted to those who follow the Roman Calendar, it seems to me that, unless a special concession has been obtained, this Titular should be celebrated as a common feast of St. Mary on the 15th of August. The following Octave, therefore, is inserted here for the benefit of those who are allowed to celebrate it according to the Roman Ordo or else by a special grant on the Sunday following the Octave of the Assumption.

Aug. 23, Vesp. de seq. com. Dom. tant.--Fest. S. Bartholomæi hoc anno transfert. in 26. Sept. *Jesu tibi sit gloria* per tot. Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.

24, Dom. *Alb.* Purissimi Cord. B. M. V. Dupl. 1. cl. cum Oct. Omnia de com. B. M. V. 9. Lect. et com. Dom. in Laud. et Miss. Præf. B. M. V. *et te in festivitate.* Evgl. Dom. in fine. In. 2. Vesp. com. Dom. et seq.

Pro Clero Romano, ut supra, sed off. prop. in supplem. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. tant.

25, Fer. 2. S. Ludovic. ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. et Cr. Vesp. de seq. Nulla com.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. sine com. Oct.

26, Fer. 3. S. Bartholom. Ap. (fuit 24 hujus) Dupl. 2. cl. ut in Calend. die 24 cum 9. Lect. et com. S. Anicet. tant. in Laud. et Miss. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. tant.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. Pro utroq.

Clero per reliq. dies ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. in Vesp. Laud. et Miss. Præf. B. M. V. et Cr.

30, Pro utroq. Clero Vesp. de seq. com. præc. et Dom. Fest. S. Raymund. hoc anno transfert in 1. Sept. et pro Clero Romano in 13 Sept.

31, Sabb. *Alb.* Octava Puriss. Cord. B. M. V. Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Fuit vir* vel ut in fest. 3. Noct. ut in fest. 9. Lect. de hom. et com. Dom. in Laud. et Miss. fest. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. Dom. S. Aegid. et SS. 12. Mart.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

Sept. 1, S. Raymundi Nonnati (fuit heri) Dupl. ut in Calend. heri cum commemor. hujus diei.

XV. ST. BARTHOLOMEW (AUGUST 24).

(*Nine Churches in* 1888.)

Ecclesiastics generally must celebrate this titular on the 24th of August; it is only in the city of Rome and where the legitimate custom or privilege prevail that it is celebrated on the 25th.

Aug. 23, Vesp. de seq. com. Dom. tant.

Pro Clero Romano, idem. Omittitur hoc anno fest. Puriss. Cordis B. M. V.

24, Dom. *Rub.* S. Bartholomæi Ap., Dupl. 1 cl. cum oct. ut in Calend. com. Dom. et seq. Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

25, Ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. in Vesp. Laud. et Miss. 3. or. *Concede* Cr. Præf. Ap.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

26, Fer. 3. *Rub.* de 3. imp. Oct. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. ex Octavar. *Si omnium* vel ex Breviar. *Scriptum est.* 3. Noct. ex Octavar (pr.) *Non omnis* vel ex Breviar. *Grandis.* 9. Lect. et com. S. Zephyr. in Laud. et Miss. fest. 3. or. *Concede* Cr. Præf. Ap. Vesp. de seq. com. Oct.

Pro reliq. dieb. Oct. pro utroq. Clero ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. Præf. Ap. et Cr. Fest. S. Raymundi perpetuo figend. 1 Sept. *et pro Clero Romano,* 6. Sept.

31, Dom. *Rub.* Octava S. Bartholomæi Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. de

Script. occ. 2. Noct. *Fundamenta* (in Brev.) 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Electurus* vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. de hom. et com. Dom. in Laud. et Miss. fest. Præf. Apost. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc. Dom. S. Aegid. et SS. 12. Mart.

Sept 1. S. Raymond. Nonnati (fixum ex heri) off. ut heri cum comm. hujus diei.

XVI.—ST. LOUIS (AUGUST 25.)

(*Forty-five churches in* 1888, *among which the cathedrals of New Orleans and St. Louis.*)

Aug. 24, Vesp. de seq. m. t. v. com. præc.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.—Videtur pro ipsis celebrand. fest. S. Barthol. die 24. (Vd. "The Pastor," III., p. 275, note.) *et hoc anno omittend.* Fest. Puriss. Cordis.

25, Fer. 2. *Alb.* S. Ludovic. Reg. C. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. Lectt. 1. Noct. *Beatus vir.* Miss. pr. cum Gl. Cr. In 2. Vesp. nulla com.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra. In 2. Vesp. com. seq.

26, Fer. 3. *Alb.* de 2. die infr. Oct. Lectt. 1. Noct. Incip. lib. Eccli. ex Dom. præc. 2. Noct. ex Breviar. *Beati* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Denique* vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. et com. S. Zephyr. in Laud. et Miss. fest. in qua 3. or. *Concede* et Cr. Vesp. de seq. com. Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. et Cr. Reliq. dieb. Oct. ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. et Cr.

31, Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. præc. Dom. S. Aegid. et SS. 12. Mart.

Pro Clero Romano, ut supra.—Fest. S. Elizabeth. ulterius figend. 6. Sept.

Sept. 1, Fer. 2. *Alb.* Octava S. Ludov. Dupl. Lect. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. in Breviar. *Deridetur* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Regio* vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. et com. S. Aegid. et SS. Mart. in Laud. et Miss. fest. in 2. Vesp. com. seq.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

XVII.—ST. AUGUSTINE (AUGUST 28).

(*Seventy churches in* 1888, *among which the cathedrals of St. Augustine, and perhaps* (*St. Augustine and St. James*) *that of Nesqually; some*

of the churches of St. Augustine may have for Titulor St. Augustine of Canterbury).

Aug. 27, Pro utroq. Clero. Vesp. de seq. sine com.

28, Fer. 5. *Alb.* S. Augustini C. D. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. ut in Calend. sine com. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. tant.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra.

Fer. 6. Sabb. Dom. et Fer. 3. ut in Calend. ritu infr. oct. cum com. Oct. et Cr.

Sept. 1, Fer. 2. *Alb.* de 5. die infr. Oct. Semid. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Non habetis* (4. die) vel ex Breviar. *Qui post Orionas.* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Considerandum* vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. et com. S. Aegid. et SS. Mart. tant. in Laud. et Miss. fest. Vesp. de seq. com. Oct.

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. ritu infr. Oct. com. Oct. Cr.

3, Fer. 4. *Alb.* de 7. die infr. Oct. ut Fer. 2. Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Cum nobis* vel ex Breviar. de com. 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Si autem* vel ut in fest. In Miss. fest. 2. or. *Concede* 3. Eccles. vel pro Papa. Vesp. de seq. (ut in 1. Vesp.).

Pro Clero Romano, ut in Calend. cum com. Oct. et Cr. 4 Fer. 5. *Alb.* Octava S. August. Dupl. Lectt. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. et 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Sollicitissime* et *Luceat* vel ut in fest. Miss. fest. in 2. Vesp. com. seq.

Pro Clero Romano, ut supra.—Fest. S. Ros. Viterb. figend. 7. Sept. ubi hoc anno fiet 9. Lect. de hom. et com. Dom.

XVIII.—ST. ROSE (AUGUST 30).

(*Seventy-one churches in* 1888, *among them the cathedral of Sacramento.*)

Aug. 29, Pro utroq. Clero Vesp. de seq. Nulla com.

30, Sabb. *Alb.* S. Rosæ Limanæ Virg. Dupl. 1. cl. cum oct. Lect. 1. Noct. *De Virginibus* omitt. 9. Lect. et com. simpl. Cr. In 2. Vesp. com. seq. et Dom.

Pro Clero Romano, Omnia ut supra.

Dom. Fer. (2. pro clero Romano) 3. (4. 5. pro Clero Romano). et 6. ut in Calend. ritu infr. Oct. cum com. Oct. et Cr.

Sept. 1, Fer. 2. *Alb.* de 3. die infr. Oct. Semid. Lect. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2.Noct. ex Octavar. *Ego licet* vel ex Breviar. *Quoniam* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Hanc* vel ut in fest. 9. Lect. et

com. S. Aegid. et SS. Mart. in Laud. et Miss. fest. Cr. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. Oct.

3, Fer. 4. de 5. die infr. Oct. ut. Fer. 2. Lectt. 2. Noct. *Nunc nobis* (in Brev.) 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Post* vel ut in fest. In Miss. fest. 2. or. *Concede* 3. Eccles. vel pro Papa. Vesp. Oct.

4, Fer. 5. de 6. die infr. Oct. ut heri Lectt. 2. Noct. ex Octavar. *Cum* vel ex Breviar. *Quoniam.* 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *Intelligamus* vel ut in fest. Vesp. a cap. de seq. com. Oct.

5, Vesp. de seq. com. præc.

Pro Clero Romano, idem.—Fest. S. Ludov. figend. 7. Sept.

6, Sabb. *Alb.* Octava S. Rosæ Dupl. Lect. 1. Noct. de Script. occ. 2. et 3. Noct. ex Octavar. *De Virginibus inquit* et *Intendat* vel ut in fest. Miss. fest. Cr. In 2. Vesp. com. Dom.

Pro Clero Romano, omnia ut supra. In 2. Vesp. com. Dom. et S. Ludov. de quo hoc anno fit ut simplex.

Other Titulars, with each but one church dedicated to them, are St. Jane de Chantal (vidua) Aug. 21, St. Philip Benitius (C. non P.) Aug. 23, and St. Joseph Calasanctius (C. non P.) Aug. 27. As a model for the Octave of St. Jane take St. Elizabeth, July 8, and for SS. Philip and Joseph, the Octave of St. Dominic.

H. GABRIELS.

CONFERENCE.

The Indulgences of the Portiuncula. (2. Aug.)

It will be remembered that the Holy Father, whilst directly encouraging the spread of the Third Order of St. Francis among the laity, nevertheless abrogated, by the Bull *Misericors Dei Filius,* the privilege of the Portiuncula, which those churches in which the Congregation of the Third Order for seculars had been canonically erected formerly claimed. Owing to the doubts which arose, either from an imperfect understanding or insufficient promulgation of this restriction, the Holy See granted for last year the continuance of the old privilege. It is not likely that the same will be repeated this year. Hence the Tertiaries and others who wish to gain

the Portiuncula Indulgence must visit either a church or chapel of the regular Franciscans or one which has obtained the privilege directly from Rome. The object of the above mentioned limitation in regard to the Portiuncula Indulgences is evidently to prevent the privilege from being undervalued and thus grow into disuse; for, as there are very many churches where the Third Order of St. Francis for seculars is at present established, the Indulgences would cease to be a privilege if they could be gained in all these churches. We subjoin the Monitum published by Cardinal Monaco, Protector of the Franciscans, last year, showing that the said privilege expired after August 2, 1889.

INDULGENTIÆ DE PORTIUNCULA IN ECCLESIIS SIVE CAPELLIS TERTIARIORUM.

Quum varia hincinde exorta fuissent dubia de perseverantia *Portiunculæ* in ecclesiis seu capellis Tertii Ordinis Sæcularis S. P. Francisci, Procurator Generalis ordinis nostri (Fratr. Min. Capuccinorum) ad S. Sedem per benevolam Emi. Cardinalis Protectoris mediationem recurrit, expostulans ut, pro hocce anno, Indulgentias de Portiuncula in omnibus ecclesiis sive capellis Tertiariorum, Christifideles servatis aliunde servandis, lucrari queant. Sanctitas vero Sua preces benigne exaudire dignata est.

Ex audientia SSmi. Die 28 Jun. 1889.

SSmus benigne annuit pro gratia juxta preces hoc anno.

R. CARD. MONACO,

Ord. Fr. Capulat. apud S. Sedem Protector.

The Indulgences of the Way of the Cross attached to a Crucifix.

Qu. 1. Cannot a priest who has the faculty of granting the Indulgence of the *Via Crucis* attach the same to a simple cross without a corpus, or is it essential that there be the figure of Our Lord upon it?

2. What material besides wood is allowable for such crosses?

3. Is a person having such a cross obliged to repeat the stations, or is any set form of prayers necessary at all, to gain the Indulgences?

Resp. The Indulgences of the *Via Crucis* can be imparted only to crucifixes, and not to simple crosses. In fact, it is to the figure of Our Lord upon the cross that the blessing is attached, so that, if by accident the cross be broken or separated from the corpus, the latter retains the Indulgences and may be fastened to a new cross without requiring another blessing. It is not sufficient to have the figure of Our Lord painted upon the cross, but it must be *aliquo modo integra* and *prominens* (S. C. I. 14 Apr. 1840).

The material of the crucifix should, in the words of Clement XIV, be brass (*un crucifissetto di ottone*). The S. Congregation, asked as to the meaning of *ottone* in this case, answered that it applied to any kind of material except such as was liable to break (per verbum *ottone* intelligendam esse exclusam materiam fragilem dumtaxat).

To gain the Indulgences attached to a crucifix of this kind it is is required 1. that it belong to the person who holds it in his or her hand for the purpose; 2. that such persons be morally unable or legitimately prevented from making the Stations of the Cross in a church or chapel; 3. that they devoutly recite twenty times the Our Father, Hail Mary, and Glory be to the Father, that is to say, one for every station, five in honor of the Five Wounds of Our Lord, and one according to the intention of the Holy Father. Those who through sickness are prevented from doing this much, can gain the Indulgence by making an act of contrition or pronouncing the words: "Te ergo quæsumus, famulis tuis subveni, quos pretioso Sanguine redemisti," whilst holding the crucifix in their hands (Brev. Pius IX, 18 Dec. 1877).

Which "Ordo"?

Qu. There are two "Ordos" in use in this diocese, the so-called Baltimore edition, and the one published by Pustet

& Co. Occasionally they differ. Is there any obligation to use the one which happens to be correct according to the general rubrics, although the other may be more commonly in use? If I suspect or happen to know that the "Ordo" is wrong, am I bound to act upon my knowledge in cases where other priests would probably follow the "Ordo," and the difference of action, as in the case of the Mass or the Collects, would be noticed in public?

Resp. If an "Ordo" is especially approved for a diocese, it is obligatory upon the secular clergy to follow it. In dioceses where the Ordinary does not especially approve an "Ordo," either the Baltimore or the Pustet edition, since both are tacitly allowed, may be used. The general rule, which may invariably be followed with safety, is: Adhere to the "Ordo," *i. e.*, the local one, which has the express or tacit approval of the Diocesan.—An in casibus dubiis adhærendum est Calendario Dioecesis, sive quoad Officium publicum et privatum, sive quoad missam, sive quoad vestium sacrarum colorem, etiamsi quibusdam probabilior videtur sententia Calendario opposita? et quatenus affirmative, an idem dicendum de casu quo certum alicui videretur errare kalendarium?

S. C. resp.: "*Standum Kalendario.*"

Die 23 Maji 1835, n. 4746 ad 2.

"Heap Coals of Fire on His Head."[1]

The proverbial phrase "to heap coals of fire on his head," in the sense of revenging an injury by an act of charity, is taken from the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans, where he says: "Revenge not yourselves, my dearly beloved.... But if the enemy be hungry, give him to eat: if he thirst, give him to drink: for doing this, thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome by evil, but overcome evil by good." St. Paul borrows the passage almost literally from the Book of Proverbs, xxv. 21, where we read, "If thine enemy be hungry give him bread to eat, and if he be thirsty

[1] Rom. xii. 20

give him water to drink: for so thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head."

"Burning coal" or "coals of fire" as a poetic figure of speech among the Hebrews had various meanings. Its most common acceptation (according to Gesenius) was "something exceedingly troublesome, which causes the severest pains and torments." The imagined effect of burning coals being placed upon a person's head as a punishment is translated into a moral sense, so as to mean "thou wilt overwhelm him with shame and remorse for his enmity towards thee." In a similar way the Arabs speak of "coals of the heart," "fire of the liver," to denote burning care, anxiety, remorse, and shame.

But what connects this figure of speech with charity as a punishment for unjust wrong? We may find the answer in another tropical use of the expression "burning coals." It frequently means "Remnant of life." In this sense it is used in the second Book of Kings, where it signifies the last scion of the house or race, and is translated by the Greek "*Zopyron*, *i. e.*, suscitabulum ignis quod vitam conservat et quasi excitat sopitam." Hence its meaning as an instrument which arouses new hope of life, when it appeared already extinct. The fact that coals were commonly kept alive under the ashes to preserve the hearth-fire naturally suggests the idea of hospitality and manifold other benefits in connection with it. "Fire" is probably among all nations the symbol of life and beneficence, whence it has always been an object of worship among pagans. Theophrastus writes that Prometheus is said to have stolen fire from heaven, which according to him means nothing else than that Prometheus taught men the divine art of reflecting, or a higher philosophy than that which follows the senses.

The Arabs use the expression "to warm a person with burning coals," for "to make a friend." Thus Rosenmüller, in his commentary on Prov. xxv. 22, says: "Paullo aliter Mohammedes proverbialem istam locutionem intellexit. Etenim Corani Sur. xli. 34., ubi hanc gnomam haud obscure al-

legat, verba ista de prunis ita expressit. . . . Is cui tecum inimicitia intercessit fiet quasi esset calidus, *calide* amans *amicus*." Hence we readily gather the aptness of the phrase to express how he who revenges a wrong by bestowing a benefit upon his enemy *overwhelms him with confusion and pain, but at the same time makes him a friend by exciting reflection upon the act of his charitable adversary*. Probably mentioning *the head* is intended to emphasize the idea of thoughtfulness and reflection which the benefit will naturally call forth, since the head is supposed to be the seat of the mental faculties. St. Cyprian, who with others of the Christian Fathers translates "coals of fire" as symbols of love and charity, because they warm the body, thinks that "heaping coals of fire upon his head" is equivalent to building a fire of coal to such a height as to overtop the enemy, as if to warm him from head to foot by our charity. "Si enim prunæ tantum in imo ponantur, non mox totus homo calescit, sed id fiet, si congerantur super caput ejus" (Lib. iii. Ad Quir.). Others refer the expression to the flush produced by the heat as an image of shame and confusion. St. Augustine says: Tropologically the coals of fire are the burning sorrow and contrition by which pride is cured in the reflection that we should have injured one who is still ready to do us kindness.[1]

The idea that the expression "burning coals" has here simply the sense of calling down the anger of God upon the adversary is held by few commentators, but it hardly harmonizes with the context of the passage.

Continuing the Mass during the singing of the Gloria or Credo.

Qu. I have a "Missa Cantata" almost every week-day in the year. Often, after many confessions, Mass is late; often, again, I must carry the Bl. Sacrament after Mass to a sick person, several miles distant. Would it be allowable on such occasions, after intoning the Gloria (or Credo) required by

[1] De Doctr. Christ., lib. iii., cap. xvi., cit. ex Corn. a Lap.

the Rubrics, to continue the Mass whilst the choir is singing the Gloria (or Credo)?

Resp. It is not permitted to omit any part of the liturgy of the solemn Mass. The Rubrics plainly oblige the celebrant to sing the "Dominus Vobiscum" after the Gloria and Credo, which in the supposed case he could not do. The Acta Synodi Diœcesanæ Neo-Eboracensis, which simply interpret the true sense of the Rubrics on this point, say: Nullus Sacerdotum quovis titulo aut prætextu Missam continuet submissa voce, quamdiu *Gloria* et *Credo* decantantur in choro.[1] Cf. also: De Herdt's "Praxis," Vol., I., iii. 2; Wapelh., Compendium S. Liturg., n. 98, 4.

Violet in Requiem Masses.

Qu. It appears that when there is solemn service of Requiem, the altar is to be covered with violet instead of black whenever the Bl. Sacrament is in the Tabernacle. If I put violet on *both sides* of the Tabernacle, and use a black antipendium, putting also black on the wall above and behind the altar, do I carry too far the principle: odiosa sunt restringenda?

Resp. The *Tabernacle* and *Antipendium* of the altar where the Bl. Sacrament is preserved are to be draped in violet whenever a solemn Requiem is celebrated thereat. All the other draping and ornaments may be black. The principle *odiosa sunt restringenda* has no application in this case, since the object of the violet color is simply to remind the faithful of the presence of the Bl. Sacrament, which fact, if properly explained to them, can only serve to enhance their devotion and confidence amid the affliction which death brings to them. The following is the latest decree from the S. Congr. of Rites on the subject, sent to an American Bishop.

DUBIUM.

Juxta Decreta Sacrae Congregationis vetitum est in Exequiis et Missis cantatis de Requie nigro panno et pallio ejus-

[1] Constitut., n. 219.

dem coloris ornare altare in quo asservatur S.S. Eucharistiæ Sacramentum. Quum vero in nonnullis locis Diœces. Nesqualien. idem S.S. Sacramentum asservetur vel in majori altari Ecclesiae, vel in unico altari aliis deficientibus, hodiernus ejusdem Diœceseos episcopus ab eadem Sacra Congregatione exquisivit: Utrum prohibitio de qua supra respiciat Altare, ubi asservatur S.S. Sacramentum extra tempus quo illud exponitur, et in ecclesiis ubi hujusmodi Altare majus vel unicum est?

S. R. C., referente subscripto Secretario, sic declarare censuit: In casu tum sacri Tabernaculi conopœum, tum Pallium Altaris esse debent violacei coloris. Atque ita declaravit, ac rescripsit. Die 1 Dec. 1882.

(Decreta Auth., n. 5858.)

ANALECTA.

REPORT OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE PROPAGATION OF THE FAITH. 1889.

The Receipts of the Association, which supports at present about three hundred foreign missions, amounted during the past year to about seven million francs. Of this sum France contributed 4,013,905 francs, that is, nearly two thirds of the entire amount. Germany comes next with 425,751 francs. Then follow Italy, Belgium, Alsace and Lorraine, British Isles, Holland, Austria, and the rest of the European States. North America, under which head the Report includes Canada, the United States, Mexico, and the Antilles, contributes 248,381 francs, that is, not quite as much as the sum collected in the province of Alsace and Lorraine, which amounts to 279,809 francs. We annex a detailed account of these latter collections.[1]

[1] For the special advantages accruing to priests who interest themselves in this edifying work, see the *American Ecclesiastical Review*, May, 1890, p. 367

the Rubrics, to continue the Mass whilst the choir is singing the Gloria (or Credo)?

Resp. It is not permitted to omit any part of the liturgy of the solemn Mass. The Rubrics plainly oblige the celebrant to sing the "Dominus Vobiscum" after the Gloria and Credo, which in the supposed case he could not do. The Acta Synodi Diœcesanæ Neo-Eboracensis, which simply interpret the true sense of the Rubrics on this point, say: Nullus Sacerdotum quovis titulo aut prætextu Missam continuet submissa voce, quamdiu *Gloria* et *Credo* decantantur in choro.[1] Cf. also: De Herdt's "Praxis," Vol., I., iii. 2; Wapelh., Compendium S. Liturg., n. 98, 4.

Violet in Requiem Masses.

Qu. It appears that when there is solemn service of Requiem, the altar is to be covered with violet instead of black whenever the Bl. Sacrament is in the Tabernacle. If I put violet on *both sides* of the Tabernacle, and use a black antipendium, putting also black on the wall above and behind the altar, do I carry too far the principle: odiosa sunt restringenda?

Resp. The *Tabernacle* and *Antipendium* of the altar where the Bl. Sacrament is preserved are to be draped in violet whenever a solemn Requiem is celebrated thereat. All the other draping and ornaments may be black. The principle *odiosa sunt restringenda* has no application in this case, since the object of the violet color is simply to remind the faithful of the presence of the Bl. Sacrament, which fact, if properly explained to them, can only serve to enhance their devotion and confidence amid the affliction which death brings to them. The following is the latest decree from the S. Congr. of Rites on the subject, sent to an American Bishop.

DUBIUM.

Juxta Decreta Sacrae Congregationis vetitum est in Exequiis et Missis cantatis de Requie nigro panno et pallio ejus-

[1] Constitut., n. 219.

dem coloris ornare altare in quo asservatur S.S. Eucharistiæ Sacramentum. Quum vero in nonnullis locis Diœces. Nesqualien. idem S.S. Sacramentum asservetur vel in majori altari Ecclesiae, vel in unico altari aliis deficientibus, hodiernus ejusdem Diœceseos episcopus ab eadem Sacra Congregatione exquisivit: Utrum prohibitio de qua supra respiciat Altare, ubi asservatur S.S. Sacramentum extra tempus quo illud exponitur, et in ecclesiis ubi hujusmodi Altare majus vel unicum est?

S. R. C., referente subscripto Secretario, sic declarare censuit: In casu tum sacri Tabernaculi conopœum, tum Pallium Altaris esse debent violacei coloris. Atque ita declaravit, ac rescripsit. Die 1 Dec. 1882.

(Decreta Auth., n. 5858.)

ANALECTA.

REPORT OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE PROPAGATION OF THE FAITH. 1889.

The Receipts of the Association, which supports at present about three hundred foreign missions, amounted during the past year to about seven million francs. Of this sum France contributed 4,013,905 francs, that is, nearly two thirds of the entire amount. Germany comes next with425,751 francs. Then follow Italy, Belgium, Alsace and Lorraine, British Isles, Holland, Austria, and the rest of the European States. North America, under which head the Report includes Canada, the United States, Mexico, and the Antilles, contributes 248,381 francs, that is, not quite as much as the sum collected in the province of Alsace and Lorraine, which amounts to 279,809 francs. We annex a detailed account of these latter collections. [1]

[1] For the special advantages accruing to priests who interest themselves in this edifying work, see the *American Ecclesiastical Review*, May, 1890, p. 367

UNITED STATES.

		Frc's.	Cts.
Diocese of	**Baltimore**	6,924.	35
	Charleston	251.	—
	Richmond	1,245.	—
	Savannah	1,653.	55
	St. Augustine	409.	60
	Wilmington	1,028.	—
"	**Boston**	29,126.	95
	Burlington	278.	45
	Hartford	10,988.	70
	Manchester	3,430.	65
	Portland	4,493.	—
	Providence	9,693.	10
	Springfield	15,314.	30
"	**Chicago**	10,640.	45
	Alton	2,942.	—
	Belleville	1,413.	—
"	**Cincinnati**	3,332.	60
	Cleveland	4,996.	94
	Covington	2,152.	60
	Fort Wayne	345.	20
	Nashville	1,102.	95
"	**Milwaukee**	6,878.	10
	Green Bay	2,635.	—
	La Crosse	1,585.	—
	Marquette	1,375.	—
	Sioux Falls	1,000.	—
"	**New Orleans**	827.	75
	V. A. Brownsville	750.	—
	Galveston	127.	20
	Little Rock	951.	—

		Frcs.	Cts
Diocese of	Mobile	1,175.	88
	Natchez	906.	66
	Natchitoches	624.	—
	San Antonio	2,057.	71
"	**New York**	8,906.	50
	Albany	7,868.	—
	Buffalo	5,460.	—
	Newark	7,113.	50
	Ogdensburg	1,245.	50
	Rochester	3,811.	—
	Syracuse	2,670.	—
"	**Oregon**	1,000.	—
	Helena	191.	48
	Nesqually	90.	—
"	**Philadelphia:** Erie	2,350.	—
	Santa Fé	2,815.	—
	V. A. Arizona	880.	—
"	**San Francisco:** Monterey	1,210.	50
	Sacramento	1.000.	—
"	**St. Louis**	1,814.	25
	Concordia	653.	—
	Davenport	4,063.	—
	Dubuque	6,075.	50
	Kansas City and St. Joseph	1,852.	—
	Leavenworth	3,209.	20
	Omaha	2,185.	—
	Wichita	316.	—
"	**St. Paul**	9,004.	—

CANADA.

	V. A. Pontiac	1,048.	—
	Antigonish	1,920.	30
	Charlottetown	5,040.	—
	St. John, N. B.	450.	—
"	**Montreal**	3,143.	74
	Sherbrooke	2,584.	60
"	**St. Boniface**	1,424.	50
"	St. Albert	1,404.	—
	V. A. British Columbia	1,350.	—
	P. A. St. Pierre and Miquelon Islands	500.	—
	Bermuda Islands.	302.	40

MEXICO.

"	**Guadalaxara**	326.	25	"	**Mexico**	5,549.	50
					Merida	1,765.	10

ANTILLES.

"	**Port of Spain**	2,969.	—	"	Guadaloupe	142.	—
	Roseau	830.	10		St. Peter and Port of France	7,925	—
"	**Port au Prince**	1,268.	—				

INDULGENCED PRAYER "O DOMINA MEA."

The Holy Father grants an Indulgence of 200 days for the devout recital of the following prayer to Our Bl. Lady. The authorship of this beautiful prayer is attributed by some to St. Charles and by others to St. Aloysius. Perhaps the saintly Cardinal taught it to the angelic youth to whom he gave first Holy Communion at the Gonzaga palace.

The Indulgence can be gained once a day, and may be applied to the suffering souls in Purgatory.

ORATIO AD BEATAM VIRGINEM.

O Domina mea, Sancta Maria, me in tuam benedictam fidem ac singularem custodiam et in sinum misericordiæ tuæ, hodie et quotidie et in hora exitus mei, animam meam et corpus meum tibi commendo; omnem spem et consolationem meam, omnes angustias et miserias meas, vitam et finem vitæ meæ tibi committo, ut, per tuam sanctam intercessionem et per tua merita, omnia mea dirigantur et disponantur opera secundum tuam tuique Filii voluntatem. Amen.

Indulg. 200 dier. aminabus def. applicab. Præsenti in perpetuum valituro absque ulla Brevis expeditione. Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus.

Die 15 Mart. 1890.

C. Card. CRISTOFARI *Præfectus.*

ALEXANDER Arch. Nicopolit. *Secretarius.*

BOOK REVIEW.

MARIA, die wunderbare Mutter Gottes und der Menschen, nach allen Gesichtspunkten dargelegt und mit sehr zahlreichen Stellen der hl. Væter u. theolog. Schriftsteller begruendet von P. Leonardus Maria Woernhart, O. S. Fr.—Innsbruck: Fel. Rauch. 1890.—Fr. Pustet & Co.

Father Faber says: "To be enthusiastic, our love of Mary only needs to be theological." Aiming to further ardent devotion towards our Bl. Lady by the methods of theology, the author of the above work

gives us an exhaustive survey of the dogmatic teaching of the Church in regard to the Mother of God. He tests the Catholic belief under this head by intrinsic as well as extrinsic arguments, and then answers the question of how we are to honor the Mother of God, by explaining the exercise of the three theological virtues, faith, hope, and charity, towards her. By far the larger portion of this volume is devoted to citations from the Fathers and other ecclesiastical writers, by which each particular point of dogmatic belief in reference to the Bl. Virgin is illustrated and corroborated in Christian tradition. The only fault we have to find with this otherwise excellent collection is, that the works from which the citations are taken are frequently only vaguely mentioned, without reference to book, chapter, and page, nor the editions which have been used for the translation. This manner of work, whilst no doubt sufficient for devotional purposes, is unsatisfactory to the theological reader, who may have occasion to verify a passage of dogmatical import, in the original source. This, too, makes a just critique of the work difficult, because we cannot easily ascertain the literal correctness of certain references, which, without allowing us to suspect the good faith of the author, bear the traces of being quoted at second hand. This is suggested by the very first sentence in the book (Vorerinnerung), which is inaccurate, at least as we find it by accident in the original and as we gave it in Father Faber's own words above. He speaks not of devotion, but of love, and does not say that this love, in order to be enthusiastic, must be theological, but that it need only be so. Such omissions may be easily remedied in a subsequent edition, especially as they occur only here and there throughout the work. It would also be desirable to have the editions of the Opera of the Fathers and other Ecclesiastical writers which the author cites mentioned either in the notes or on a separate page of the volume. For sermon matter on the subject the book is to be greatly recommended.

CANTORINUS ROMANUS seu Collectio Compendiosa cantionum ecclesiasticarum quas editiones typicæ S. R. C. Missalis, Ritualis et Pontificalis Romani continent ad instructionem cantum choralem discentium editæ. Ratisbonæ, Neo Eboraci & Cincinnatii: Fr. Pustet, S. Sedis Apost. et S. Rit. Congr. Typographi. 1890.

This is an edition of the liturgical chants contained in the Missal, Ritual, and Pontifical, and especially prepared for the use of clerical seminaries. It will be remembered that by order of the Holy See a

thorough revision and correction of the musical portion of the liturgical books was made some years ago, in order to do away with many local peculiarities and to secure absolute uniformity in the public service of our churches. Accordingly it was made obligatory upon the bishops everywhere throughout the Latin Church to have this form of chant, which was to be found in the so called typical editions of Fr. Pustet, introduced in their churches. To facilitate this reformatory movement, the present work was printed. It contains in convenient form those portions of the liturgical books with which every cleric or priest must be familiar in order to exercise his ministry with becoming dignity and unto edification. Teacher and pupil will find it equally a welcome text-book. There is a good and accurate alphabetical index at the end, referring to the Antiphons, Psalms, Hymns, Litanies, Prefaces, Responses, and the different tones. The price is exceptionally low, no doubt with a view to easy introduction.

Josephi Fessler quondam Episcopi S. Hippolyti INSTRUCTIONES PATROLOGIÆ quas denuo recensuit, auxit, edidit Bernardus Jungmann, Profess. ord. Hist. Eccl. et Patrolog. in Universitate Lovaniensi. Tom. I.—Oeniponte, 1890. Sumpt. Feliciani Rauch. Ratisb., Neo Ebor. et Cincin.: Fr. Pustet.

Since Bishop Fessler wrote his higly appreciated *Instructiones*, forty years ago, criticism has considerably occupied itself with the authenticity of the writings of what is commonly called the Apostolic age. Some doubtful portions of these valuable documents have been cleared up, and the questionable authorship of others, if not absolutely determined, at least divested of much extravagant conjecture which a former age had attached to them. This is notably the case with regard to the writings which pass under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite. Hypathius, Bishop of Ephesus, was the first to call their genuineness into question when they were adduced as testimony of the disciple of St. Paul in favor of the Monophysite heresy. This was early in the sixth century. At the time of the so called Reformation Erasmus of Rotterdam was among the first to point out the evident inconsistency of attributing these works to a writer of the time of St. Paul. Some critics, however, maintained the genuineness of this nominal authorship. They based their assertion on the titles of the epistles, which were addressed to contemporaries of the apostles, and mention as such the names of Timothy, Titus, Carpus, Sosipater, and Polycarp. They describe

facts which occurred during that time, and at which the author says that he was present in person. Moreover, the elevated tone of these writings, the manifest sincerity of the writer, who shows himself deeply versed in mystic theology and to have been a man of wide and solid erudition, dispel the suspicion that he could have wished to practise any imposition so as to pass a work composed by himself for the labor of one antedating his own time by several centuries. There was no reason or interested motive which could have caused him to attempt such an imposition. For, although it has been asserted that he favored the Monophysite heresy, and may have wished to let it appear that the apostles taught this error, it is not easy to prove this, unless upon partial evidence, which is amply contradicted in other portions of the same writings. Nor could the author, if he intended to deceive, have passed unnoticed the fact of his own inconsistency in mentioning incidents which happened much later than the alleged date of his writing. This is the principal objection brought against the supposition which refers these documents to apostolic times. The very titles of the books savor of a later age, as for example that *De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia*, and another *De Mystica Theologia*. Moreover, the writer enunciates certain dogmatic definitions which were formulated only at the Council of Nice. He speaks of "ancient Catholic tradition," and mentions rites and ceremonies in the administration of the sacraments which took form only as the Church grew, and he dwells on the vows made in the monastic institutions. All this can hardly come from a contemporary of St. Paul.

But how are we to explain the discrepancy between these facts and the author's assertion that he witnessed occurrences and knew persons living in the earlier half of the first century?—It is here where critics of recent times have shown their ingenuity. Among them are distinguished Hipler, Nirschl, and Frothingham. The two former show by skilful summoning of historical records, that the incidents mentioned in the writings of Dionysius are not those we read of in the gospels, but similar ones, which occurred in the writer's own time, and which he connects with the acts of the apostles by a common analogy. In the same way he gives certain mystic appellations to the friends to whom he writes and with whom he converses. This also accounts for his own by-name of the Areopagite. The author is supposed to have been a well-known Egyptian monk, whom Sozomenus mentions in his ecclesiastical

history as having opened a catechetical school at Rhinocorura. Frothingham attributes the Areopagitic writings to a disciple of the monophysite monk Stephan Bar Sudailus, who is said to have died at the beginning of the sixth century. But whilst it is quite safe to assume that these writings cannot be attributed to the Dionysius the Areopagite whom St. Paul converted, as related in the Acts, partly from the intrinsic evidence already mentioned and partly from the absolute silence of all ecclesiastical writers during the first four centuries concerning these documents, which could hardly have escaped their attention, it seems unlikely that they should have originated as late as the beginning of the sixth century. Stephen Bar Sudailus died—according to Frothingham—in 510. But we know that these writings were passed as Apostolic testimony in 532, which could scarcely have been attempted if they had originated only at that time.

Whilst Father Jungmann does not pretend to decide this controversy, he adds considerably to the value of Bishop Fessler's original work by setting forth the true merits of the question as it appears at present. The practical conclusion is, that the writer of the works referred to is certainly not Dionysius the Areopagite of whom we read in the S. Scriptures, but rather a skilled theologian of the fifth century. Nor need we suppose that he wished to deceive his readers as to his true identity. He simply adopted a method, common enough not only among the early Christian writers, but even in our own day, by which he thought to give a certain weight to his arguments, since they were the same which were used by the apostolic men in whose society he pictures himself as living. His platonic manner of writing rather confirms this notion.

It is by such erudition as this, that Dr. Jungmann has made the old edition of the *Instructiones Patrologiæ* almost a new and certainly timely work. We owe him likewise a great deal of what we would call, for want of a better name, the philosophy of Patristic development. He points out the influence which the study of Greek and Latin letters exercised upon the writings of the Fathers. We do not agree, as we have shown elsewhere, with Bishop Fessler's theory any more than with Moehler's, according to which the age of the Christian Fathers trenches upon the scholastic period. However, for this Father Jungmann cannot be made responsible, nor would it have been fair to the original,

had he changed anything in this respect. Indeed, the work as a whole is entirely free from blemish and will serve as a useful and safe introduction to the study of the Fathers. The present volume reaches up to the fourth century, including St. Ambrose and Pope Damasus.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

The mention of Books under this head does not preclude further notice of them in subsequent numbers.

DER HEILIGE WUNDERSMANN ANTONIUS VON PADUA UND SEINE VEREHRUNG DURCH DIE NEUN DIENSTAGE. Von P. Sebastian Scheyring. Vierte, vermehrte u. verbesserte Auflage—Innsbruck. Fel. Rauch 1890. Fr. Pustet & Co., New York and Cincinnati.

GESCHICHTE DER DEUTSCHEN ST. MARIEN GEMEINDE von New Albany, Indiana, im Zusammenhange mit der Diocesan-Kirchengeschichte, von Rev. Edm. J. P. Schmitt.—Cincinnati, O.: S. Rosenthal & Co. 1890.

ANALECTA LITURGICA. Fasc. V. (Quarterly). W. H. James Weale, 15 in the Grove, Clapham Common, S. W. London. 1890.

PRACTICAL SANITARY AND ECONOMIC COOKING adapted to persons of moderate and small means, by Mrs. Mary Hinman Abel.—The Lomb Prize Essay.—Published by the American Public Health Association. 1890.

Fr. Pustet & Co., New York & Cincinnati.

TEXT BOOKS.

Published by FR. PUSTET & CO.

History of the Church, from its first establishment to our own times, designed for the use of Ecclesiastical Seminaries and Colleges. By Rev J. A. Birkhæuser. Octavo, 804 pp. Cloth extra . . . . . **Net, 3 00**

Latin Grammar, adapted for the use of Colleges, from the fifteenth German edition of Prof. Dr. F. Schultze's Grammar. Ninth edition. 12mo., 316 pages. Cloth **1 25**

Latin Exercise Book, by the same author, to accompany the Grammar. Eighth edition. 12mo., 300 pp. Cloth **1 25**

Exercises for Translation into Latin, chiefly on the rules of Syntax. By Rev. P. J. Müller, S. J. 12mo., 380 pages. Cloth **1 25**

Elementary Grammar of the Greek Language, for the use of Colleges. Chiefly from the works of Prof. F. Spiess and Dr. M. Seiffert. By J. M. A. Schultheiss. Third edition. 12mo., 245 pages. Cloth **1 25**

Greek and English Exercises, arranged according to the Greek Grammar of F. Spiess and M. Seiffert, by Dr. T. Breitter. Translated from the Eleventh German Edition, with a Supplement containing Greek and English Exercises in Syntax, by Rev. Prof. Jos. Rainer. Second edition. 12mo., 204 pages. Cloth **1 25**

Compendium Theologiæ Moralis, a Joanne Petro Gury, S. J., primo Exaratum et deinde ab Antonio Ballerini, Ejusdem Societatis, Adnotationibus Auctum, Nunc vero ad Breviorem Formam Redactum atque ad Usum Seminariarum Hujus Regionis Accommodatum ab Aloysio Sabetti, S. J. *Editio Quarta.* Ab Auctore recognita ad normam Conc. Plen. Balt. III. atque recentiorum Congr. Rom. decretorum. Octavo, viii and 891 pp. durably bound in ½ Mor . . . . . **Net, 3 50**

Practical Guide, for the recitation of the Roman Breviary. By Rev. J. A. Baur. Translated and enlarged by P. Aug. Schneider, O. S. B. 12mo., 114 pp. Cloth . . . . . **Net, 50**

Magister Choralis. A theoretical and practical manual of Gregorian Chant for the use of the clergy, seminarians, organists, choir-masters, choristers, etc. By Rev. F. X. Haberl, D.D., Ratisbon. Translated and enlarged by the Rt. Rev. N. Donnelly, D. D. 12mo., 300 pp. Half-Morocco **90**

The same in *German* **60**

The same in *French, Latin, Italian, Spanish, or Polish* . . . . . **each, 90**

Short Instruction in the Art of Singing Plain Chant. With an Appendix, containing all Vesper Psalms and the Magnificat, the Responses for Vespers, the Anthiphons of the Blessed Virgin, and Various Hymns for Benediction. Designed for the use of Catholic Choirs, Colleges, and Schools, by Prof. John Singenberger. Third Revised and Enlarged Edition. Price, per copy . . . . . **Net, 25**

Wollinger, Jos., Lehrbuch für den gesammten deutschen Sprachunterricht an Realschulen und verwandten Lehranstalten, mit Uebungsaufgaben und einem Wœrterbuche. viii und 478 S **1 25**

—— Deutsches Lesebuch für Realschulen und verwandte Lehranstalten, in 3 Abtheilungen; Erster Theil, für die unteren Kurse. 420 S **1 00**

Zweiter Theil, für die mittleren Kurse. 384 S **1 00**

Dritter Theil, für die oberen Kurse. 424 S **1 00**

Quæstiones Mechlinienses in Rubricas Breviarii et Missalis Romani. Provinciis Fœderatis Americæ Septentrionalis Adaptatæ. Cura H. Gabriels, S.T.D., Seminarii S. Joseph, Trojæ, Rectoris. 12mo. 180 pp. . . . . **Net, 1 00**